DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 023 UD 014 334

AUTHOR	Lede, Naomi W.; Dixon, Hortense W.
TITLE	Urban Minority Groups in Houston: Problems, Progress, and Prospects. A Statistical and Analytical Study.
INSTITUTION	Texas Southern Univ., Houston. Urban Resources Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	29 Mar 73
NOTE	468p.; Charts on pages 146-163 of this document will not be clearly legible due to print size in the original
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$22.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Age Groups; *City Demography; Economically Disadvantaged; Employment Statistics; Family Income; High School Graduates; Marital Status; *Minority Groups; Population Trends; Racial Distribution; Socioeconomic Status; *Statistical Analysis; *Urban Population
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

This document is one of a series about the conditions of blacks and other minorities in Houston, Texas. Statistics are presented on selected characteristics of minority persons in Houston and parts of Harris County. This document is designed to provide data in an organized and systematic way by bringing together in one convenient source socioeconomic facts about the minority community and by keeping the document constantly up to date through more current reports. Data for the central city and some suburban rings in close proximity to Houston proper are given when this type of distinction appears to be significant. The major areas treated in this report are: general socioeconomic characteristics, population and distribution, family and household size, education, employment and income, housing, poverty, politics, health, economic development statistics, and other pertinent data on minority problems and accomplishments. The preparation of the volume was guided by three major concerns: the assessment of problems; a review of progress or accomplishments in the light of civil rights legislation; and a general projection of future needs and prospects. Information in the volume is classified according to major socioeconomic and demographic areas. Also, within each area, various subtopics or subdivisions are used. (Author/JM)

ED 094023

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

URBAN MINORITY GROUPS IN HOUSTON:
Problems, Progress, and Prospects

A Statistical and Analytical Study

by

Naomi W. Ledé and Hortense W. Dixon
Texas Southern University

UD 014334

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The preparation of this report was financed, in part, from funds provided under HUD Contract No. 1709 with the Urban Resources Center in Texas Southern University by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

FOREWORD

by

Hortense W. Dixon
Director, the Urban Resources Center

The book which follows is a working document of the Texas Southern University Urban Resources Center. The document, which has grown out of an effort to develop linkages between a minority urban university and local government, is a codification of relevant data that, when viewed collectively, represents the "living environment" of minorities in an urban area. More than that, it is an attempt to introduce to policy makers a non-entity in the process -- the minority perspective.

The organization of this book follows, in a formal way, the most chronic problems of minorities during this century. There is, however, a much deeper criticism of the linear approach that has characterized public policy during this period. A careful reading of each section will suggest that the state of affairs in one area is intricately and irrevocably related to each of the other conditions.

This working document will be used by the Texas Southern University Urban Resources Center in making Phase I recommendation to the University administration such program adaptations, innovations, and improvements that have the potential for impacting on urban problems. It is viewed, similarly, as a being replicable by other black colleges in bringing the unique resources of these institutions to bear on the quality of life in an urbanized society. Perhaps, it will also become a useful resource for policy makers and planners in the public and private sector who share with us a sense of responsibility for the quality of life in the cities.

The Texas Southern University Urban Resources Center would appreciate responses from the people who read this document -- responses describing policy alternatives and strategies for change related to the major area presented herein.

March 29, 1973

Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas

CONTRIBUTORS

The Urban Resources Center Staff gave invaluable aid in the completion of the document. Twenty graduate urban interns work in the URC. Several of these students collected data for specific sections of the volume. A listing of the contributors and the categories of research for data which they collected may be found below.

GENERAL SUPERVISION - Kathryn A. Goode, Administrative Assistant in the Urban Resources Center, supervised and edited the complete report. She aided in the computation and statistical analysis of the data. Mrs. Goode holds a Bachelor of Arts degree, with Afro-American Studies as an area of specialization, from Smith College.

GENERAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS - Alicia H. Mathis, B.A., Social Service, Prairie View A. and M. College.

EMPLOYMENT & POVERTY - Mrs. James M. Spigner, B.A., Elementary Education, Southern University (Baton Rouge).

INCOME - Shirley M. West, B.A., Sociology, Alcorn University; attended University of Mississippi Law School.

EDUCATION - Lankford Bolling, B.A., Psychology, Bradley University.

HOUSING - Anne R. Harris, Bachelor in Music Education, Texas Southern University

HEALTH - Floyd Briscoe, B.A., History and Biology (Pre-Medical major), Texas Southern University

CRIME & POLITICS - Birdie Burch, B.A., Sociology and Anthropology, Whittier College.

Regina Drake, B.A., Sociology, University of Houston.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Tremaine B. Williams, B.A., Administration of Justice, Southern Illinois University (Carbondale, Illinois).

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - Barbara Marcus, B.S., History, Boston University.

CIVIL RIGHTS - Lester Simon, B.A. History, Texas Southern University.

INTRODUCTION

The central purpose of this volume is to provide composite data on the minority population of Houston. We have organized the data along interdisciplinary lines in order to provide comprehensive and current information on many levels. The major sections of this report deal with general socio-economic characteristics, such as employment, population and migration, income, poverty, education and family size; housing, health, crime, economic development, politics, desegregation, and progress in civil rights for Houston and parts of Harris County. Data on the black population is more extensive than that for the Mexican-American population. In the latter case, only limited information is certain categories was available.

In the preparation of the volume, we were guided by three major concerns: the assessment of problems; a review of progress or accomplishments in the light of civil rights legislation; and a general projection of future needs and prospects. The combined effects of this kind of presentation (it is hoped) will provide the means through which an objective status of minority groups in Houston can be established. What we have tried to do is to present, in statistical form, as much information as possible on Houston. Some facts are included for the total Standard Metropolitan

Statistical Area, for Texas, and the nation. In some instances, data for these categories are used for comparative purposes.

Many subjects of concern have been given brief treatment, and will be analyzed in greater detail in subsequent reports. This is particularly true for health and crime. Explanations accompanying some of the sections are also very brief. For those interested in further details, the footnotes, sources and special references, and Appendices should be helpful.

Much of the statistical data were drawn from the 1970 U. S. Census Reports, abstracts and reviews of special government documents, newspaper articles, United States Department of Labor special reports, the World Almanac, court cases, and other references. Detailed definitions are given for certain items; explanatory notes are included where appropriate; and adequate references are cited for materials which did not originate with the United States Census reports.

There may be some discrepancies in the data collected from the Uniform Crime Reports, as will be for data on the crime situation in Houston. Many individual figures do not add up to the totals, as would be expected. No explanations were given in the sources used. We assume some of the data are cumulative, particularly where central city and suburban crime rates are analyzed. Also, there is evidence that the Census Bureau (Houston Chronicle, May 8, 1973) underestimated the overall population by about three percent, with the black population undercount at 7.7 percent of the total black population. This means that about 24,000 blacks were missed in the 1970 Census of Population. Generally, a three percent differential is not considered to be as serious as an 8 percent discrepancy, as it is with the black population estimates. Due to this reported omission, any discrepancies between earlier data and some of the current figures elicited from surveys may be attributable to errors in the tabulations.

Information in the volume is classified according to major socio-economic and demographic areas. Within each area, various sub-topics or sub-divisions are used to categorize and emphasize particular issues when considered pertinent.

The volume represents the first in a series of reports to be published by the Urban Resources Center in Texas Southern University. It should not be judged as empirical research. Instead, it is a collection of data from many sources; it is a pooling of ideas about the problems, progress, and prospects of minority group persons in the Houston area. We speak of black and brown communities; we included their perceptions, attitudes, and responses to particular data items; we do not speak for these communities. The credit for whatever worth lies in this report must go to the many individuals in the communities and in the Urban Resources Center, who contributed to the completion of the study. A convoy of graduate urban interns collected materials from documentary sources and through telephone and personal interviews. These graduate students in Sociology and Urban Community Development were trained by some of the prestigious colleges and universities in the nation, including a select number of predominantly black institutions.

For most of these students, the research tasks involved provided impetus to their quest for broader experiences and desires to provide expert and wholesome leadership for the black communities from which they come. We applaud these graduate students for their contribution to the volume and our sincere gratitude accompanies this recognition.

Every effort has been made to check the accuracy of all materials used, and when possible, data have been updated and corrected. Whatever errors are present, by commission or omission, are due to our inadequacies. We accept full responsibility for any mistakes that may have eluded our best efforts.

Texas Southern University May, 1973	Naomi W. Ledé Director of Research

CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii

CONTRIBUTORS v

INTRODUCTION vii

LIST OF TABLES xiii

DEFINITIONS xxii

CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS 1

Population growth and migration; education; income; poverty; subsidy vs. welfare; employment and occupational data

CHAPTER TWO: EDUCATION AND DESEGREGATION 79

Teacher assignments; withdrawals; busing versus desegregation: some research findings; progress toward desegregation; statistics on higher education and state employment by race

CHAPTER THREE: HOUSING NEEDS AND MINORITY GROUPS 123

General characteristics of housing; discrimination in housing; low income housing; housing code enforcement

CHAPTER FOUR: HEALTH CARE AND THE BLACK POPULATION 165

Health needs of Houston's minorities; cost; hospital care; improvements and recommendations; some medically-related concerns by the black population

CHAPTER FIVE: POLITICS AND THE MINORITY VOTER 188

CHAPTER SIX: CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND THE MINORITY COMMUNITY . . 205

Race and crime; statistics on crime; national statistics on crime; dimensions of the crisis of crime; plea bargaining; attitudinal factors and law enforcement; federal criminal justice support; black lawyers

CHAPTER SEVEN: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: MINORITY BUSINESSES . 249

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE PROGRESS OF CIVIL RIGHTS 264

Civil rights legislation; employment with the City of Houston; employment: communications media; socio-economic and political progress; political aspects of progress; the challenge ahead

APPENDICES 294

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. General Characteristics of the Population by Region and Race, 1970 3

2. Negro Population, 1970, 1960, and 1950, for 30 Cities With the Largest Negro Population 6

3. Negro and Other Races Population Change and Net Migration, 1960 to 1970, for 30 Cities the Largest Negro Population: 1970 7

4. Thirty Places with the Highest Proportion of Negroes, by Rank: 1970, 1960, and 1950 8

5. A Distribution of the Population by Race, Median Years of School Completed, Percent High School Graduates, and County, 1970 10

6. School Enrollment of the Population (3-34 years) of Houston by Race, 1970 13

7. Years of School Completed by Minority Groups by Sex (Houston, 1970) 14

8. Percentage of the Population Enrolled in School by Age and County, 1970 15

9. A Distribution of Median Family Income For Forty (40) Select Cities in the U. S., 1970 17

10. Median Family Income for the Total Population in Each County and by Race, 1970 19

11. A Comparison of Annual Income by Race and by Decade with that for the County 20

12. Poverty Status of Residents of Houston by Race: 1970 23

13. Poverty Status of Residents of Houston in 1969 by Race: 1970 25

Table Page

14. Selected Demographic Characteristics from the 1970 Census for Harris County 33

15. Selected Demographic Characteristics from the 1970 Census for Fort Bend County 34

16. Selected Demographic Characteristics from the 1970 Census for Brazoria County 36

17. Employment Status by Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex . 38

18. Employment Status of Men Aged 20-64 Years, By Marital Status and Ethnic Group 39

19. Employment Status of Women Aged 20-64 Years, By Marital Status and Ethnic Group 40

20. Employment Status of Men by Age, Educational Attainment, and Ethnic Group 41

21. Employment Status of Women by Age, Educational Attainment, and Ethnic Group 43

22. Unemployment During Previous Year by Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex 45

23. Employed Persons By Industry Group, Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex 46

24. Employed Persons by Occupation, Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex 47

25. Annual Money Income by Ethnic Group and Family Status in the "Original CEP Area" of the Houston Labor Market, July 1968-June 1969 50

26. Estimated Unemployment Levels and Rates in Houston SMSA and Central City Area, Annual Averages, 1967 through 1969 51

27. Employment Status by Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex in the "Original CEP Area" of the Houston Labor Market, July 1968-June 1969 52

28. Unemployment Experience During Previous Year by Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex in the "Original CEP Area" of the Houston Labor Market, July 1968-June 1969 53

Table | Page
29. Reasons Not Looking and Future Jobseeking Intentions of Persons Not in the Labor Force Who Want a Job Now, by Ethnic Group, in the "Original CEP Area" of the Houston Labor Market, July 1968-June 1969 . 54

30. Reasons Not Looking and Future Jobseeking Intentions of Persons Not in the Labor Force Who Want a Job Now, by Ethnic Group and Sex 55

31. Weekly Earnings by Ethnic Group and Sex 56

32. Employment Characteristics of Residents of Houston by Race - 1970 58

33. Employment Characteristics of the Population of Houston 1970 59

34. Employment Characteristics of the Population of Houston - 1970 60

35. National Unemployment Rates: 1949 to 1970 61

36. Unemployment in Central Cities and Suburbs of All and the 20 Largest Metropolitan Areas: 1970 63

37. Percent of Black and Other Races in the Total Employed Population, by Metropolitan Area: 1970 64

38. Employment of Blacks by All Federal Agencies in Each of the Commissions Regions as of November 30, 1970 . 66

39. Federal Employment, by Grade and Salary Group: 1965 and 1970 67

40. 1970 Minority Group Study; Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area; Houston, Texas; Full-Time Employment as of November 30, 1970 68

41. Industry, Last Occupation of the Experienced Unemployed, And Income in 1967 of the Residents of Houston, 1970 (Type of Income of Families) . . 71

42. Industry, Last Occupation of the Experienced Unemployed, And Income in 1969 of Residents of Houston by Race - 1970 (Industry) 72

43. Industry, Last Occupation of the Experienced Unemployed, and Income in 1969 of the Residents of Houston by Race - 1970 73

Table Page

44. Industry, Last Occupation of the Experienced Unemployed, and Income in 1969 of Residents of Houston: 1970 (All Income) 74

45. Occupation and Earnings of Residents of Houston by Race - 1970 75

46. Occupation and Earnings of Residents of Houston by Race - 1970 76

47. Occupation and Earnings of the Residents of Houston by Race - 1970 77

48. Percentage Distribution of Elementary Pupils for Select Schools by Race 87

49. Percentage Distribution of Selected Junior High Schools by Race, 1970-1972 89

50. A Percentage Distribution of Select Senior High Schools by Race 91

51. Teacher Assignments for Three Elementary Schools by Race . 93

52. Pupil-Teacher Ratios for Select High Schools by Race. . . 93

53. Race of Students and Staff as Reported on H.E.W. Reports (as of October 2, 1972). 94

54. Withdrawals from Selected Schools in the Houston Independent School District, 1970-1972 96

55. Busing Statistics for Houston 103

56. A Percentage Distribution of Pupils in Selected Schools in HISD (Most Desegregated) 106

57. A Percentage Distribution of Pupils for Select Schools in HISD (Least Desegregated) 107

58. Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data From Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1970 (with 1972-73) 110

59. College Enrollment of Persons 18 to 24 Years Old, by Sex: 1965 and 1970 111

60. Black Students Enrolled in College by Type of Institution: 1964 to 1968, and 1970 112

61. Percent of Persons 25 Years Old and Over, Who Completed Four Years of High School or More and Four Years of College or More, for Selected Metropolitan Areas: 1969 . 113

Table Page

78. Gross Rent of Renter Occupied Housing Units: 1970 . . 158

79. Gross Rent of Renter Occupied Housing Units with Negro Head of Household: 1970 159

80. Gross Rent of Renter Occupied Housing Units with Household Head of Spanish Language or Spanish Surname: 1970 160

81. Persons in Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units with Household Head of Spanish Language or Spanish Surname: 1970 161

82. Persons in Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units with Household Head of Spanish Language or Spanish Surname: 1970 162

83. Persons in Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units with Household Head of Spanish Language or Spanish Surname 163

84. Infant Deaths by Race and Sex, Houston Residence, 1961-1971 172

85. Infant Summary of Death, Houston Residence, 1971 . . 173

86. Deaths by Race and Sex, Houston Residence, 1960-1971 . 174

87. Frequency of Selected Statistics, Houston Residence, 1971 176

88. Births by Race, Houston, Texas. 177

89. Illegitimates by Race and Sex, Houston Residence, 1963-1971. 178

90. Harris County Delegation in the Texas Legislature . . 196

91. Harris County House Members Committee Assignments . . 197

92. Bond Election - Houston, Texas, February, 1973 . . . 199

93. Committee Assignments of Veteran and Freshmen Black Congressmen: All Democrats 201

94. Voter Analysis in President's, U.S. Senate, and Governor's Race 202

95. Race of Persons Arrested under 18 years of age . . . 210

96. Sex of Persons Arrested under 18 years of age. . . . 211

Table Page

62. Average Budgeted Faculty Salaries and Ranges, by Rank and Institution for Public Senior Colleges and Universities in Texas; Nine months: 1972-73 114

63. Average Budgeted Faculty Salaries for Public Junior Colleges in Texas; Nine months: 1972-73 116

64. Number of State Employees by Race and Average Pay for State Employees by Race 117

65. Proportion of Blacks and Mexican-Americans in 20 Key State Agencies 118

66. Educational Attainment of Employed Persons by Occupation, Ethnic Group, and Sex. 119

67. Educational Attainment of Workers by Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex 120

68. Tenure and Plumbing Facilities for Negro Occupied Units, for 30 Cities With the Largest Negro Population: 1970 126

69. Value of Owner Occupied Housing Units: 1970. 146

70. Value of Owner Occupied Housing Units with Negro Head of Household: 1970 148

71. Value of Owner Occupied Housing Units with Household Head of Spanish Language or Spanish Surname: 1970. . . . 150

72. Household Composition for Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units: 1970 152

73. Household Composition for Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units with Negro Head of Household: 1970 . . 153

74. Household Composition for Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units with Head of Household of Spanish Language or Spanish Surname: 1970 154

75. Income in 1969 of Families and Primary Individuals in Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units: 1970 . . . 155

76. Income in 1969 of Families and Primary Individuals in Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units with Negro Head of Household: 1970. 156

77. Income in 1969 of Families and Primary Individuals in Owner and Renter Occupied Housing Units with Household Head of Spanish Language or Spanish Surname: 1970 157

Table Page

97. Race of Persons Arrested 18 years of age and over. 212

98. Sex of Persons Arrested 18 years of age and over 213

99. City Arrests by Race, 1971 (Under 18). 216

100. City Arrests by Race, 1971 (18 and over). 217

101. City Arrests by Race, 1971 (Total). 218

102. Suburban Arrests by Race, 1971 (Under 18) 221

103. Suburban Arrests by Race, 1971 (18 and over) 222

104. Suburban Arrests by Race, 1971 (Total) 223

105. Total Arrests by Race, 1971 (Under 18) 224

106. Total Arrests by Race, 1971 (18 and over) 225

107. Total Arrests by Race, 1971 (Total) 226

108. Texas Schools Participating in LEEP With Law Enforcement Enrollment and Majors, July 1, 1971. 242

109. Employment Data for Small Business Establishments in Houston 251

110. Information on Location of Business Establishments . . . 252

111. Marketing Area and Consumer Problems 253

112. Communities Served by Small Businesses in Houston According to Race of Owner 254

113. Principal Competitors of Businesses According to Race of Owner. 255

114. Environmental Factors of Business Places. 255

115. Educational Attainment and Business Ownership by Race, 1972 256

116. Types of Advertising Media Used by Small Business Owners . 256

117. Residential Data and Ownership 257

Table Page

118. Percentage of Firms by Type of Business with Specified Percentage of Customers Residing Within Ten Blocks of the Firm. 258

119. Percentage of Certain Retail and Service Firms with Specified Percentage of Customers Residing Within Ten Blocks of the Firm. 259

120. Length of Time at Present Location and Length of Life by Type of Business and by Ethnic Backgrounds of Owners 260

121. Length of Time at Present Location and Length of Life for Certain Retail and Service Firms 261

122. Ownership and Monthly Rentals by Type of Business and Ethnic Background of Owner. 262

123. Ownership and Monthly Rentals for Certain Retail and Service Firms 263

124. A Numerical and Percentage Distribution of Employees for the City of Houston by Race and Sex (April, 1973) 274

125. A Numerical and Percentage Distribution of Employees for the City of Houston by Race (April, 1973). 276

126. Census Tract for Houston 294

127. Percent Distribution of Population by Census Tract and County, 1970 298

128. Number of Persons per Household by Census Tract and County, 1970 312

129. Employment Status of the civilian noninstitutional population in Dallas and Houston by ethnic group, sex, and age -- 1970 annual averages 326

130. Employment Status of the civilian noninstitutional population in Texas by ethnic group, sex, and age -- 1970 annual averages 327

131. Full- and part-time status of the civilian labor force in Texas, Dallas, and Houston by ethnic group -- 1970 annual averages 328

132. Employed persons 16 years old and over in Texas by occupation, sex, and ethnic group -- 1970 annual averages 329

Table Page
133. Employed persons 16 years old and over in Dallas SMSA by occupation, sex, and ethnic group -- 1970 annual averages 330

134. Employed persons 16 years old and over in Houston SMSA by occupation, sex, and ethnic group -- 1970 annual averages 331

135. Members of the Texas State Board of Education 339

136. A Numerical and Percentage Distribution of Voters in Mayoral Campaign by Race (Houston, 1971) 340

137. A Distribution of Predominantly Black Precincts by Presidential and Gubernatorial Candidates and Percentage Turnout (Harris County-November, 1972 . . 341

138. A Distribution of Voters in Predominantly Black Precincts by Total Registered, Candidate, and Percentage Turnout (November and December, 1971) 344

139. A Percentage Distribution of Predominantly Mexican-American Precincts by Presidential and Gubernatorial Candidates and Percentage Turnout (Harris County, November, 1972) 346

140. A Distribution of Predominantly Mexican-American Precincts in Mayoral Campaign (Houston, Texas, 1971) . 347

141. A Distribution of Revenue Sharing Allocation 348

142. Amount of Money Received in the First Installment of Revenue Sharing 350

143. Revenue Payout by States 351

DEFINITIONS OF SELECTED DATA ITEMS

Several types of sources have supplied information for this document. Statistical data pertaining to population characteristics have been drawn from reports of the United States Bureau of the Census for the years indicated. Other sources consisted of news releases, pamphlets, and original studies conducted by various researchers. Field interviews and telephone surveys were conducted to obtain attitudinal data on certain problem areas included in the report. References are cited for data which did not originate with the 1970 Census reports.

For the sake of clarity, definitions and explanations of selected data items are included to explain a great deal of the information extracted from the 1970 Census of the population. These definitions and explanations are as follows:

GENERAL

All population and housing figures presented in the report were taken from the 1970 Census of Population, as taken by the U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, as of April 1, 1970. The information secured from this source is representative of five percent and fifteen percent samples of the total population. Some items, however, represent twenty percent samples.

COLUMN HEADINGS

The same definition applies each time a particular term is used, regardless of the geographic location of the area. Classifications are given in some tables for TOTAL, NEGRO (OR BLACK), TOTAL WHITE & OTHER and SPANISH AMERICAN. Note that Spanish American is not, by census definition, a racial category and therefore is not a consideration in obtaining a breakdown of the total population. Because of this, some figures will not total in the tables. Definitions of the various population groups are as follows:

TOTAL - The total population of a geographic area comprised of all persons enumerated whose usual place of residence at the time of census was determined to be in that area.

NEGRO (BLACK) - Includes persons who indicated their race as "Negro or Black." Also includes persons who indicated the "other race" category and furnished a written entry that should be classified as "Negro or Black."

TOTAL WHITE & OTHER - For this report, "Total White & Other" is defined as the total population less the Negro population. This group includes those tabulated as Spanish American as well as American Indian, and all other race categories not tabulated as "Negro or Black."

SPANISH AMERICAN - For data items based on a five percent sample the Spanish American group includes all persons who reported Spanish American origin or descent as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South America or other Spanish. For data items based on 15 percent or 20 percent samples, the Spanish American group refers to different populations in different areas of the country: (1) in the three Middle Atlantic States of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, people of Puerto Rican birth or parentage; (2) in the five Southwestern States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas, people of Spanish Language or of Spanish surname; (3) in the remaining 42 States and the District of Columbia, people of "Spanish Language." Any person who reports Spanish as his or her mother tongue is considered a person of Spanish language. The Spanish surname population is identified by computer matching with a list of about 8,000 such names.

NUMBER AND PERCENT - The number under each of the racial/ethnic categories is the projected number of persons tabulated in that demographic category based on the sample data. PERCENT is always calculated as the proportion of people in each demographic category relative to the total number of people in each racial/ethnic category. Assume, for example, that there is a total population of 100 in an area. Eighty are white and other and 20 are black. If four of the white and other are 65 or older and below the poverty level, then the percentage for this category is calculated as 4/80 or five percent.

ROW HEADINGS

The following definitions apply to data categories listed on the left-hand side of each table:

POPULATION - Comprises all persons enumerated whose usual place of residence at the time of census was determined to be in that area.

EDUCATION COMPLETED - Population 25 years old and over by years of school completed. The persons enumerated were asked the highest grade or year of regular school they ever attended up to six or more years of college. Persons in school at the time of the census were assumed to have completed that year. Persons were also asked whether they finished the year specified as the highest grade attended. The number tabulated in each category of years of school completed includes persons who report completing that grade or year plus those who attended but did not complete the next higher grade.

<9 YEARS - Includes all persons who stopped school before the ninth grade, including those who never attended school.

9-11 YEARS - Includes persons who have completed nine but less than twelve years of shcool.

HIGH SCHOOL - Count of persons who have completed four years of high school but no college.

1-3 YRS. COLLEGE - Count of persons who have completed at least one but less than four years of college.

4 OR MORE YRS. COLLEGE - Count of persons who have completed four or more academic years of college.

VOCATIONAL - Ascertained for persons 14-64 years of age who were asked whether they ever completed a vocational training program. Such training might be offered, for example, in high school; as an apprentice; in a school of business, nursing, or trades; in a technical institute; or an armed forces school. Vocational training does not include courses received by correspondence, on-the-job training, or armed forces training not useful in a civilian job. Data for this item are based on a five percent sample.

IN SCHOOL IN 1970 - Ascertained for persons three years and older, who were classified as enrolled in school if they attended regular school or college at any time between February 1, 1970, and April 1, 1970. "Regular" schooling includes nursery school, kindergarten, and schooling leading to an elementary school certificate, high school diploma, or college degree. Data for these items are based on a 15 percent sample.

PRE-SCHOOL - Includes persons enrolled in nursery school or kindergarten.

ELEMENTARY - Includes grades one through eight. Persons enrolled in a junior high school are classified as enrolled in elementary school or high school according to year in which enrolled.

HIGH SCHOOL - Includes grades nine through twelve. (See elementary school, above, for treatment of junior high school enrollment.)

COLLEGE - Includes one through six years or more. College enrollment is defined to include enrollment in junior or community colleges, regular four-year colleges, and graduate or professional schools.

INCOME - Tabulation within each income group is the count of families and unrelated individuals (economic units) receiving an annual income within the stated income range. Income is ascertained for all persons fourteen years of age and over for the calendar year 1969. Total income is the sum of the dollar amounts of money that respondents reported receiving (best estimate if exact amount not known) as wages or salary income, nonfarm and farm self-employment income and other income. Family or household income (the combined incomes of all members of each family or household) are treated as a single amount. Unrelated individual income is the amount of each individual's total income. Data has been summarized for the following income groups:

<$1,000
$ 1,000 - $ 1,999
$ 2,000 - $ 2,999
$ 3,000 - $ 3,999
$ 4,000 - $ 5,999
$ 6,000 - $ 9,999
$10,000 - $14,999
$15,000 OR MORE

The figures presented are the sum of all families and unrelated individuals fourteen years of age or over reporting an annual income within each range.

MEDIAN FAM. INCOME - Estimated median family income as calculated from a table containing the number of families receiving income within fifteen income intervals. (See family income defined above.)

MED. PER/CAP. INCOME - Estimated median individual income as calculated from a table containing the number of unrelated individuals 14 years old and over within each of fifteen income intervals.

BELOW POVERTY LEVEL - In 1970, families and unrelated individuals (excluding college students in dormitories and armed forces personnel in barracks) are classified as being above or below the poverty level, using the poverty index adopted by a federal interagency committee in 1969. This index takes into account such factors as family size, number of children, and farm or non-farm residence, as well as the amount of money income.

NO. OF FAMILIES - Number of families reported to be below the poverty level at the time of the 1970 Census.

FAMS. W/CHILDREN <6 - Number of families with children under six years of age reported to be below the poverty level at the time of the 1970 Census.

NO. OF PERSONS 65+ - Number of persons 65 years old and over reported to be below the poverty level at the time of the 1970 Census.

HOUSING - Tabulations within this category are based on the count of occupied housing units for which value or rent is tabulated. Value is tabulated only for one-family houses (one-unit structures), detached or attached, which were owner-occupied and which were not on places of ten or more acres, or on properties which also had a business establishment or medical or dental office. Cooperatives, condominiums, mobile homes, and trailers were excluded from the value tabulations. Rent is tabulated for units rented for cash rent, excluding one-family housing on places of ten or more acres.

MEDIAN MONTHLY RENT - Estimated median monthly gross rent paid for renter-occupied units for which rent is tabulated. Gross rent represents the contract rent plus the average monthly cost of utilities (water, electricity, gas and fuel) to the extent that these are paid for by the renter (or paid for by a relative, welfare agency, or friend) in addition to the rent. See remarks under "HOUSING" for definition of units for which rent is tabulated. The median rent is calculated from a table containing the number of units within each of fourteen rent intervals.

MED. VALUE OWNER OCC. - Estimated median value of owner occupied housing units for which value is tabulated. The value of owner-occupied units is established by the respondent's estimate of how much the property would sell for on the current market. See remarks under "HOUSING" for definition of units for which value is tabulated. The median value is calculated from a table containing the number of occupied units within each of eleven intervals.

TRANSPORTATION TO WORK - Ascertained for persons fourteen years of age and over who reported working during the week before the 1970 Census including armed forces personnel. Respondents were asked what principal mode of travel or type of conveyance they used to get to their place of work on the last day they worked. Data are based on a fifteen-percent sample.

PRIVATE AUTO - Includes persons who reported they were the driver or a passenger in a private auto.

PUBLIC TRANSP. - Includes persons who reported their mode of transportation to work by bus or streetcar, subway or elevated, railroad, or taxicab.

OTHER - Includes persons who reported their mode of transportation to work to be walked only, worked at home, or other means.

OCCUPATION - Population sixteen years old and over in the experienced civilian labor force or in the labor reserve. Employed persons were to report the occupation at which they worked the most hours during the calendar week prior to date of enumeration. The experienced unemployed and persons in the labor reserve were to report their last occupation. Data are presented for six major occupation groups and the experienced unemployed. Each occupation group is identified by Census Code numbers according to the U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Occupational Classification Index.

PROFESSIONAL, TECH. - Includes employed persons sixteen years old and over who are classified as professional, technical, and kindred workers. This group includes such occupations as accountants, computer specialists, engineers, lawyers, mathematical specialists, physicians, nurses, teachers, and scientific technicians.

MANAGERS & ADMIN. - Includes employed persons sixteen years old and over who are classified as managers and administrators, except on farms. Included are such occupations as public administrators, bank officers, buyers, inspectors, railroad conductors, pilots, school administrators, and others.

CLERICAL AND SALES - Includes employed persons sixteen years and over classified as sales, clerical, and kindred workers. Included are advertising agents, insurance agents, salesmen, sales clerks, bookkeepers, mail carriers, office machine operators, secretaries, and others.

CRAFTSMEN & FOREMEN - Employed persons sixteen years old and over classified as craftsmen and kindred workers. Included are such occupations as bakers, carpenters, electricians, mechanics and repairmen, plumbers, and others.

SEMI-SKILLED - Includes employed persons sixteen years old and over who were employed in non-farm occupations not otherwise classified. Includes operatives, transport equipment operatives; laborers, except farm; service workers; and private household workers.

FARM WORKERS - Employed persons sixteen years old and over working in occupations classified as farmers or farm managers, farm laborers and farm foremen.

EXPERIENCED UNEMPLOYED - Experienced unemployed population sixteen years of age or over who were neither "at work" nor "with a job but not at work" during the calendar week prior to April 1, 1970. Persons waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off or who were waiting to report to a new wage or salary within 30 days were counted among the unemployed. Unemployment rates are based on the experienced civilian labor force since occupation and industry cannot be ascertained for those unemployed who have never worked.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

This document is one of a series about the conditions of blacks and other minorities in Houston, Texas. Statistics are presented on selected characteristics of minority persons in Houston and parts of Harris County. The Urban Resources Center in Texas Southern University seeks to communicate information on the problems, issues, and accomplishments of the minority communities. This document is designed to provide data in an organized and systematic way by bringing together in one convenient source socio-economic facts about the minority community and by keeping the document constantly up to date through more current reports.

Data for the central city and some suburban rings in close proximity to Houston proper are given when this type of distinction appears to be significant. The major areas treated in this report are general socio-economic characteristics, population and distribution, family and household size, education, employment and income, housing, poverty, politics, health, economic development statistics, and other pertinent data on minority problems and accomplishments.

POPULATION GROWTH AND MIGRATION

The City of Houston is ranked sixth among the country's largest cities in 1970, and it enjoys the distinction of being the largest population center in the South. Harris County is the central county comprising the Houston Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) and, as such, it provides diversified services for area residents.

The 1970 Census (Fourth Count) reports the population of Harris County as 1,741,912. For the total SMSA, the population is estimated to be 1,985,031. Included in this total is a rather large concentration of minority groups. The dominant minorities in the Harris County area are blacks, Mexican-Americans, and American-Indians. Since World War II the black population has increased in Houston in both relative and absolute terms. For instance, in 1950 blacks comprised an estimated 21.1 percent of the population, but by 1960, the percentage had increased to 23.2 percent; in 1970, the percentage of blacks in Houston had reached approximately 25.7 percent. Table 1 shows a numerical and percentage distribution of the population of the total SMSA by race and county for 1970.

Blacks represented 19.3 percent of the population for the total SMSA for 1970; 9.4 percent of the population in Brazoria County; 17 percent in Fort Bend County; 11.8 percent of Montgomery County's population; and 20.1 percent of the persons in Harris County for 1970. The black population of Liberty County was 6,861 for the same period, or 20.8 percent. Approximately 5 percent of the population of Baytown

(3)

Table 1

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION BY REGION AND RACE, 1970

			FORT BEND COUNTY			HARRIS COUNTY						MONTGOMERY COUNTY		
RACE	TOTAL SMSA	BRAZORIA COUNTY	Total	Houston (part)	Balance	Total	Baytown	Houston (part)	Pasa-dena	Balance	LIBERTY COUNTY	Total	Houston (part)	Balance
All Persons	1,985,031	108,312	52,314	53	52,261	1,741,912	43,980	1,232,740	89,277	375,915	33,014	49,479	9	49,470
White	1,587,485	97,685	43,168	53	43,115	1,377,118	41,631	904,827	88,840	341,820	26,053	43,461	9	43,452
Black	382,382	10,137	8,876	-	8,876	350,668	2,158	316,551	45	31,914	6,861	5,840	-	5,840
Percent Black	19.3	9.4	17.0	-	17.0	20.1	4.9	25.7	0.1	8.5	20.8	11.8	-	11.8

was black in 1970. There are a few blacks in Pasadena, Texas, a Houston suburb, with the figure being less than one percent.

As shown below, Houston has had a steady increase in the number of blacks in the city since 1950.

YEAR	TOTAL POPULATION	BLACK POPULATION	PERCENT BLACK
1950	806,700	170,211	21.1%
1960	938,219	217,662	23.2%
1970	1,232,740	316,551	25.7%

The growth of Houston, like other cities of comparable size, has been attributed to several migratory trends. The urban population has exceeded the rural population during every decade since the Civil War. One migratory effect includes the in-migration of persons from rural areas to urban centers. Persons from rural East Texas and parts of Western and Southern Louisiana make up the bulk of the in-migration sector of the area. In addition, Texas Southern University attracts a large proportion of black students from out of state and, upon graduation, many of these students remain in the city. The internal growth of families currently residing in Houston has also contributed to the population increase of the city and the black population.

The movement of blacks and other minorities into Houston and its suburban fringes began early in the twentieth century. A sustained mobility of blacks from rural areas to the central city has occurred during the last several decades. This migratory movement has been interpreted by some as a combination of "push" and "pull" factors -- the push of limited social and economic opportunities characteristic of many rural areas in the South, and the magnetic pull of more promising and prevailing opportunities at the destination point. With its rather kaleidoscopic changes, Houston has attracted its share of blacks, but unlike some larger cities, the in-migration of blacks into Houston has been somewhat selective. It appears that a majority of the persons coming into the city bring greater skills than blacks moving into some of the other urban areas. In addition, Houston has been able to hold more qualified blacks, with diversified degrees of competency, than cities such as Dallas, Texas, and Saint Louis, Missouri.

For the nation as a whole, the proportion of blacks in central cities increased for each region between 1960 and 1970. Outside the South, the percentage of blacks in the suburbs (outside central cities) remained approximately the same in some areas. For Houston, more blacks are moving into "suburbia." This movement may be due to the increased percentage of blacks falling within the middle class.

Black population growth in central cities cannot be gainsaid. In 1970, four out of every ten blacks in the United States were living in the 30 cities with the largest black populations. This percentage of the total black population residing in the 30 selected cities has shown a steady increase since 1950. Tables 2, 3, and 4 rank cities according to the total population and the percentage representation for blacks for 1950, 1960, and 1970.

"Characteristically, cities harbor a larger number and a greater diversity of groups than any rural area." In addition, the growth of cities seems to make group relations more contentious, or at least

Table 2. Negro Population, 1970, 1960, and 1950, for 30 Cities With the Largest Negro Population

(Rank according to 1970 Negro population. Numbers in thousands)

Total population	Negro population	City and State	Number	Percent Negro	Number	Percent Negro	Number	Percent Negro
		United States, total.....	22,578	11	18,872	11	15,042	10
		30 selected cities, total	9,217	29	6,837	22	4,501	15
		Percent of U.S.........	41	(X)	36	(X)	30	(X)
1	1	New York, N.Y............	1,667	21	1,088	14	749	10
2	2	Chicago, Ill.............	1,103	33	813	23	493	14
5	3	Detroit, Mich............	660	44	482	29	299	16
4	4	Philadelphia, Pa.........	654	34	529	26	376	18
9	5	Washington, D.C..........	538	71	412	54	280	35
3	6	Los Angeles, Calif.......	504	18	335	14	171	9
7	7	Baltimore, Md............	420	46	326	35	224	24
6	8	Houston, Tex.............	317	26	215	23	125	21
10	9	Cleveland, Ohio..........	288	38	251	29	148	16
19	10	New Orleans, La..........	267	45	234	37	181	32
27	11	Atlanta, Ga..............	255	51	186	38	121	37
18	12	St. Louis, Mo............	254	41	214	29	153	18
17	13	Memphis, Tenn............	243	39	184	37	147	37
8	14	Dallas, Tex..............	210	25	129	19	58	13
36	15	Newark, N.J..............	207	54	138	34	75	17
11	16	Indianapolis, Ind........	134	18	98	21	64	15
48	17	Birmingham, Ala..........	126	42	135	40	130	40
29	18	Cincinnati, Ohio.........	125	28	109	22	78	16
38	19	Oakland, Calif...........	125	35	84	23	48	12
23	20	Jacksonville, Fla........	118	22	*106	*23	*82	*27
26	21	Kansas City, Mo..........	112	22	83	18	56	12
12	22	Milwaukee, Wis...........	105	15	62	8	22	3
24	23	Pittsburgh, Pa...........	105	20	101	17	82	12
57	24	Richmond, Va.............	105	42	92	42	73	32
16	25	Boston, Mass.............	105	16	63	9	40	5
21	26	Columbus, Ohio...........	100	19	77	16	45	12
13	27	San Francisco, Calif.....	96	13	74	10	43	6
28	28	Buffalo, N.Y.............	94	20	71	13	37	6
75	29	Gary, Ind................	93	53	69	39	39	29
30	30	Nashville-Davidson, Tenn.	88	20	*76	*19	*64	*20

X Not applicable.

* 1960 and 1950 populations revised in accordance with 1970 boundaries.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Table 3. Negro and Other Races Population Change and Net Migration, 1960 to 1970, for 30 Cities With the Largest Negro Population: 1970

(Numbers in thousands. Minus sign (-) denotes decrease)

Cities	1970	Change, 1960 to 1970	Net migration, 1960 to 1970	
			Number	Percent[1]
New York, N. Y....................	1,844	+703	+436	+38
Chicago, Ill......................	1,159	+322	+113	+14
Detroit, Mich.....................	673	+185	+98	+20
Philadelphia, Pa..................	670	+135	+40	+7
Washington, D.C...................	547	+124	+38	+9
Los Angeles, Calif................	642	+225	+120	+29
Baltimore, Md.....................	426	+98	+32	+10
Houston, Tex......................	328	+111	+56	+26
Cleveland, Ohio...................	293	+40	-3	-1
New Orleans, La...................	270	+35	-11	-5
Atlanta, Ga.......................	256	+70	+33	+18
St. Louis, Mo.....................	257	+41	-1	-
Memphis, Tenn.....................	244	+60	+23	+12
Dallas, Tex.......................	218	+87	+47	+36
Newark, N.J.......................	214	+75	+32	+23
Indianapolis, Ind.................	137	+36	+15	+15
Birmingham, Ala	127	-8	-23	-17
Cincinnati, Ohio	127	+17	-3	-2
Oakland, Calif	148	+51	+29	+30
Jacksonville, Fla	121	+15	-4	-4
Kansas City, Mo...................	116	+31	+13	+16
Milwaukee, Wis....................	112	+46	+23	+35
Pittsburg, Pa.....................	108	+6	-6	-6
Richmond, Va......................	106	+13	+1	+1
Boston, Mass......................	116	+48	+26	+39
Columbus, Ohio....................	102	+24	+9	+12
San Francisco, Calif..............	204	+69	+37	+28
Buffalo, N.Y.	98	+25	+9	+12
Gary, Ind.........................	94	+24	+10	+14
Nashville-Davidson, Tenn..........	89	[2]+12	+2	+3

- Rounds to zero.
1 Base is population at beginning of period.
2 1960 population revised in accordance with 1970 boundaries.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Table 4. Thirty Places With the Highest Proportion of Negroes, by Rank: 1970, 1960, and 1950

(Rank according to percent Negro in 1970. (U) denotes unincorporated place)

Rank	City and State	1970				1960 percent Negro	1950 percent Negro
		Negro		Total population	Population 15 years and over--percent Negro		
		Percent of total	Number				
1.	Willowbrook, Calif.. (U)................	82.3	23,616	28,705	82.1	(X)	(X)
2.	Westmont, Calif. (U)	80.6	23,635	29,310	75.3	(X)	(X)
3.	Washington, D.C.....	71.1	537,712	756,510	65.4	53.9	35.0
4.	Compton, Calif......	71.0	55,781	78,611	66.6	39.4	4.5
5.	East St. Louis, Ill.	69.1	48,368	69,996	63.9	44.5	33.5
6.	East Cleveland, Ohio	58.6	23,196	39,600	51.3	2.1	0.2
7.	Florence-Graham, Calif. (U).........	56.0	24,031	42,895	56.0	44.9	(X)
8.	Highland Park, Mich.	55.3	19,609	35,444	48.5	20.9	8.4
9.	Petersburg, Va......	55.2	19,914	36,103	51.7	47.2	42.2
10.	Newark, N.J.........	54.2	207,458	382,417	49.0	34.1	17.1
11.	East Orange, N.J....	53.1	40,099	75,471	47.4	24.9	11.4
12.	Gary, Ind...........	52.8	92,695	175,415	49.2	38.8	29.3
13.	Bessemer, Ala.......	52.2	17,442	33,428	48.5	57.4	60.7
14.	Greenville, Miss....	52.0	20,619	39,648	48.9	48.6	59.3
15.	Atlanta, Ga.........	51.3	255,051	496,973	46.8	38.3	36.6
16.	Prichard, Ala.......	50.5	21,005	41,578	47.2	47.1	33.5
17.	Augusta, Ga.........	49.9	29,851	59,864	45.7	45.0	41.0
18.	Selma, Ala..........	49.7	13,606	27,379	46.2	49.2	55.2
19.	Vicksburg, Miss.....	49.3	12,568	25,478	46.0	46.4	48.8
20.	Ft. Pierce, Fla.....	48.5	14,422	29,721	42.5	46.9	40.4
21.	Goldsboro, N.C......	48.1	12,896	26,810	45.1	41.2	44.9
22.	Baltimore, Md.......	46.4	420,210	905,759	41.9	34.7	23.7
23.	Charleston, S.C.....	45.2	30,251	66,945	39.8	50.8	44.0
24.	Chester, Pa.........	45.2	25,469	56,331	40.9	33.3	20.9
25.	New Orleans, La.....	45.0	267,308	593,471	40.1	37.2	31.9
26.	Savannah, Ga.........	44.9	53,111	118,349	41.0	35.5	40.4
27.	Inkster, Mich.......	44.5	17,189	38,595	44.0	34.5	53.7
28.	Atlantic City, N.J..	43.7	20,937	47,859	38.5	36.2	27.2
29.	Detroit, Mich.......	43.7	660,428	1,511,482	39.8	28.9	16.2
30.	Wilmington, Del.....	43.6	35,072	80,386	37.1	26.0	15.6

Note: Of 200 places with a total population of 25,000 or more and Negro population of at least 10,000, the 30 places with the highest proportion of Negroes were presented by rank.

X Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

more unstable and problematic, than do rural communities. In part this instability arises from the sheer rapid growth of cities, which means that the numerical distribution of groups is constantly changing. The article, "Cities and Group Conflict," emphasizes the fact that rural-urban migrants are drawn out of the local context in which their relations formed part of a traditional fabric and are transplanted into a new one in which the order is worked out on a more competitive basis.[1] Research data will show that a large proportion of Houston's minorities came to the city from rural areas and that these same individuals are exposed to a new kind of order. Black population growth in Harris County, accelerated by the coincidence of technology and changing urban patterns, has had some effects upon the city. An examination of select socio-economic variables shows the degrees of uneveness in the social, economic, and political life of the black segment of the population in relation to its white counterpart. Principal differences between white and nonwhite families are shown in education, income, poverty, housing, employment, occupation, transportation to work, family size, and other related factors. Sections included in this report provide data and limited analyses of the inequities and achievements of the black population in Houston. Limited information is also available on the Mexican-American population of the city.

EDUCATION

The median years of schooling completed for persons 25 years of age and over for the total population in the Standard Metropolitan

Statistical Area for 1970 was 12.1 years, with 51.7 percent of the population listed as high school graduates. For Houston proper (as part of Harris County), the median educational level for the total population was 12.1, and 51.8 percent of the population indicated that they were high school graduates, comparing favorably and equally with the SMSA as a whole.

The median school years completed for persons 25 years of age and over in the black population of the city include 10.2 years for all blacks in the SMSA, with 32.7 percent of the population graduating from high school. For blacks in Houston proper, about 35 percent of the population are high school graduates, with a median educational level for the total black population as 10.4 years. These findings are based on national sample statistics collected by the United States Bureau of the Census for 1970. Table 5 shows a distribution of the population by median school years completed.

Table 5
A Distribution of the Population by Race, Median Years of School Completed, Percent High School Graduates, and County, 1970

COUNTY	TOTAL POPULATION Median	TOTAL POPULATION % High School Graduates	BLACK POPULATION Median	BLACK POPULATION % High School Graduates	SPANISH LANG. OR SURNAME Median	SPANISH LANG. OR SURNAME % High School Graduates
Brazoria	12.1	53.3	8.7	20.9	7.7	27.8
Fort Bend	9.7	34.5	8.3	17.1	5.7	10.5
HARRIS	12.1	52.7	10.3	34.0	9.1	34.2
Liberty	10.1	33.1	7.8	19.2	8.2	31.7
Montgomery	11.3	44.2	8.4	22.1	11.7	48.6

Some of the significant highlights regarding educational attainment in Houston will be treated in the next chapter on "Education." However, we would like to emphasize the following findings:

1. The level of education for blacks in Houston is below that for the total population of Brazoria (12.1) and Montgomery (11.3) counties, but above the median educational levels for whites in Fort Bend (9.7) and Liberty (10.1) counties.

2. Proportionately, as many black as white high school graduates went on to college in 1972, and the black dropout rate before high school graduation has declined sharply during the last decade, according to a report of the United States Department of Labor. On the basis of available statistics, 49.4 percent of the whites and 47.6 percent of the black high school graduates of last June enrolled in college as of 1972. The 1.8 percent differential is considered "statistically insignificant." In Houston complete figures were not available but reliable sources indicate that black college enrollment of graduates from high schools in the city is also increasing. The Texas Southern University enrollment increases reflect this trend. Enrollment at TSU mushroomed during the last several years, with an increase of almost 50 percent (from less than 3,000 in the early 1960's to more than 6,000) for the 1972-73 academic year.

3. Despite the upsurge in college enrollment, it is believed that a larger proportion of young blacks still leave school before high school graduation, about 19 percent as of October, 1972, as compared to around 13 percent for whites in the Nation as a whole. Relative rates, however, have changed markedly during the last few years. In 1963, 33 percent of all blacks dropped out, almost twice as many as whites, with 17 percent dropout rate. In 1968,21.6 percent and 12.5 percent respectively; in 1970, 23 and 11.7 percent; and in 1971, 20 and 12 percent. Approximately 347,000 young blacks were graduated from high school in 1972.

4. The black population of Houston had attained more years of schooling, in absolute and relative terms, than their racial counterparts who reside outside of the central city for 1970.

5. Among persons 3 and 4 years of age, more black children than white or those with Spanish surnames are enrolled in school. 17 percent of all black children 3 and 4 years of age, as compared to 16.3 percent for the total population and 9.2 percent of the children with Spanish surnames, were found to be enrolled in public or private schools and day care centers in 1970. The enrollment figures are partially due to the increased number of day care centers partially financed through Model Cities programs, HCCA and other federally-funded day care center.

Table 6 shows the school enrollment for the population of persons 3 through 34 years of age and nursery school and kindergarten enrollment for 1970. Table 7 gives a numerical and percent distribution of persons by race and according to years of school completed while Table 8 reveals the percentage of the population enrolled in school by select ages and by county.

As will be noted in Table 6, the greater proportion of blacks between the ages of three and thirty-four years were enrolled in public elementary schools. As of 1970, less than three percent of the black school-age population was in nursery school; 6.2 percent in kindergarten; 64.3 percent in elementary schools (1 to 8 years); 20.4 percent in high schools; and 6.4 percent of the black population of Houston in college.

From the data presented, it is safe to conclude that the educational attainment of the population in Houston, Harris County, and for the

TABLE 6

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF THE POPULATION (3-34 YEARS) OF HOUSTON BY RACE, 1970

School Enrollment	Urban Black (Percent)	Urban Spanish (Percent)
Total Enrollment, 3 to 34 years old	101,694	49,384
Nursery School	2,743 (2.7%)	858 (1.7%)
Public	948	329
Kindergarten	6,291 (6.2%)	3,407 (6.8%)
Public	5,024	2,811
Elementary (1 to 8 years)	65,416 (64.3%)	32,730 (66.3%)
Public	64,291	30,542
High School (1 to 4 years)	20,709 (20.4%)	9,591 (19.4%)
Public	20,108	8,791
College	6,535 (6.4%)	2,798 (5.7%)
Percent Enrolled, 3 to 34 years old	52.0	49.7
3 and 4 years old	17.0	9.2
5 and 6 years old	64.3	65.3
7 to 13 years old	96.7	96.7
14 and 15 years old	96.3	93.0
16 and 17 years old	87.3	79.7
18 and 19 years old	47.3	48.8
20 and 21 years old	19.0	15.8
22 to 24 years old	9.9	11.1
25 to 34 years old	4.5	3.8

TABLE 7

YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY MINORITY GROUPS BY SEX
(Houston, 1970)

Years of School Completed	(Urban) Total Black	Percent Black	(Urban) Total Spanish-American	Percent Spanish American
Male, 25 years and over...........	67216	(46.7)	30146	(50.3)
No school years completed......	1962	2.9	2389	8.0
Elementary: 1 to 4 years......	7506	11.1	3946	13.1
5 to 7 years......	12386	18.4	6164	20.4
8 years...........	5654	8.4	2479	8.2
High School: 1 to 3 years.....	17635	26.2	4744	15.7
4 years..........	13343	19.9	4620	15.3
College: 1 to 3 years.........	5327	8.0	2805	9.3
4 years or more......	3403	5.1	2999	10.0
Median school years completed.....	10.0	----	9.1	----
Percent high school graduates.....	32.8	----	34.6	----
Female, 25 years and over.........	76566	(53.3)	29808	(49.7)
No school years completed......	1528	2.0	2692	9.0
Elementary: 1 to 4 years......	5157	6.7	4030	13.5
5 to 7 years......	11856	15.5	6071	20.4
8 years...........	6489	8.5	2598	8.7
High School: 1 to 3 years.....	23725	31.0	5241	17.6
4 years..........	16954	22.1	5596	18.8
College: 1 to 3 years.........	5697	7.4	2107	7.1
4 years or more......	5160	6.7	1473	4.9
Median school years completed.....	10.7	----	8.8	----
Percent high school graduates.....	36.3	----	30.8	----

Table 8. Percentage of the Population Enrolled in School by Age and County, 1970*

County and Age	% Total Population
Brazoria	
16 and 17 years	89.0
18 and 19 years	57.9
20 and 21 years	16.4
22 to 24 years	11.1
25 to 34 years	7.2
Fort Bend	
16 and 17 years	82.3
18 and 19 years	50.2
20 and 21 years	11.2
22 to 24 years	3.9
25 to 34 years	1.4
Harris	
16 and 17 years	88.5
18 and 19 years	54.4
20 and 21 years	25.2
22 to 24 years	13.6
25 to 34 years	5.3
Liberty	
16 and 17 years	81.6
18 and 19 years	41.9
20 and 21 years	10.6
22 to 24 years	3.2
25 to 34 years	2.5
Montgomery	
16 and 17 years	80.2
18 and 19 years	40.6
20 and 21 years	14.8
22 to 24 years	5.7
25 to 34 years	1.9

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing: 1970, "Census Tracts", Final Report PHC (1)-89, Houston, Texas, SMSA.

total SMSA varies by race. More importantly, today many young black children begin some form of schooling at the age of 3 or 4. Sharp differences exist in the median years of schooling completed by age and race. The black population of Harris County 25 years of age and over and in most other adult age groups was slightly below whites in the proportion of high school graduates when compared with whites and Spanish-speaking persons and/or those with Spanish surnames. In the latter instance, the difference was minimal (0.2 percent). In Montgomery County, the Spanish category for the percentage of high school graduates surpasses that for the total population as a whole. Only 44.2 percent of the total population in Montgomery County completed high school as compared with 48.6 percent for persons of Spanish origin or with Spanish surnames. These data are shown in Table 5.

INCOME

Houston ranks 19th among forty of the nation's largest cities in median family income according to figures appearing in the Houston Post (October 3, 1972). The figures for each city were tabulated for central cities, excluding larger metropolitan areas. Using the available data, cities were ranked according to median family income. These data are shown in Table 9.

The annual family income for the black population increased tremendously during the decade, 1960-1970, but it still falls behind

Table 9

A Distribution of Median Family Income For Forty (40) Select Cities in U.S., 1970

Rank	City	Median Income
1.	Honolulu	$12,539
2.	San Jose, Calif.	11,927
3.	Seattle, Washington	11,037
4.	Indianapolis, Indiana	10,754
5.	St. Paul, Minnesota	10,544
6.	Los Angeles, Calif.	10,535
7.	San Francisco, Calif.	10,503
8.	Toledo, Ohio	10,474
9.	Long Beach, Calif.	10,282
10.	Milwaukee, Wisconsin	10,262
11.	Chicago, Illinois	10,242
12.	Omaha, Nebraska	10,208
13.	San Diego, Calif.	10,166
14.	Detroit, Michigan	10,019
15.	Rochester, New York	10,002
16.	Minneapolis, Minnesota	9,960
17.	Phoenix, Arizona	9,956
18.	Kansas City, Missouri	9,910
19.	Houston, Texas	9,876
20.	Tulsa, Oklahoma	9,870
21.	Portland, Oregon	9,799
22.	Columbus, Ohio	9,731
23.	New York, N.Y.	9,682
24.	Denver, Colorado	9,654
25.	Oakland, Calif.	9,626
26.	Washington, D.C.	9,583
27.	Nashville, Tenn.	9,473
28.	Davidson, Tenn.	9,473
29.	Philadelphia, Penn.	9,366
30.	Fort Worth, Texas	9,271
31.	Boston, Mass.	9.133
32.	Cleveland, Ohio	9,107
33.	Oklahoma City, Okla.	9,106
34.	Cincinnati, Ohio	8,894
35.	Baltimore, Md.	8,815
36.	Buffalo, N.Y.	8,804
37.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	8,800
38.	Jacksonville, Fla.	8,671
39.	Memphis, Tenn.	8,646
40.	Louisville, Kentucky	8,546

the income level of white families in Harris County. Black family income did not increase in the same proportion as white income despite the fact that the average black family has more mouths to feed. The number of persons per household for white families was 3.19 in 1970 for Harris County, 3.09 for Houston proper, and 3.21 for the total SMSA. For the black population, the number of persons per household for Harris County was 3.51; for Houston proper, 3.47; and for the total SMSA, 3.50. Refer to the Appendices for complete data given by census tract for total population, total white, total black and percentages; a percent distribution of population by census tract and county; and the number of persons per household by census tract and county for 1970.

The median family income for families and unrelated individuals for the total Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area was $8,686 in 1970; in Harris County, $8,742; in Houston proper, $9,876. Black median family income for the total SMSA was $6,213, which is about $2,000 less than total population family income for the same category. In Harris County, the black population had a median family income of $6,371, about $2,300 less than that for the total population. In Houston alone, the income differential between black and white families approximates more than $2,000. In the other four counties comprising part of the metropolitan area, income inequities between the races are evident. Table 10 shows a distribution of family income for the total SMSA, by county and by race.

Table 10

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME FOR THE TOTAL POPULATION IN EACH COUNTY AND BY RACE, 1970

County	Total Population	Black Population	Spanish/Surname*
Total SMSA	$8,686	$6,213	$8,218
Brazoria	9,682	5,071	7,839
Fort Bend	7,257	4,258	6,548
HARRIS	8,742	6,371	8,373
Liberty	6,117	4,712	5,154
Montgomery	7,632	3,734	8,200

*It should be noted that the "Spanish/Surname" category is not truly representative of the incomes of Mexican-American or Chicano residents in Houston and the other counties. As indicated in "Definitions of Selected Data Items," the Spanish American group includes all persons who reported origin or descent as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish. In fact, the Spanish American category is more representative of the category "other minorities and nonwhites," not including blacks.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Census of Population and Housing: 1970, "Census Tracts," Final Report, Houston, Texas SMSA PHC (1)-89.

National, state, and local statistics show that despite gains in the area of civil rights during the last decade, inequities exist between white and nonwhite persons in Houston and other parts of the country. Gains in income were experienced by all groups but for blacks, these gains were not sufficient enough to erase wide differentials in income and occupational status. While black income did increase, white income increased also. The gap narrowed slightly in some sections of the country, but proportionately -- in Houston as elsewhere -- gains in black income were not substantial enough to close previous gaps.

The largest proportion of blacks are still found at the lower end of the income scale. Table 11 compares the annual income range from 1960 with that for 1970 for blacks, with totals for the county as a whole.

Table 11

A COMPARISON OF ANNUAL INCOME BY RACE AND
BY DECADE WITH THAT FOR THE COUNTY*

Income Category	1960		1970	
	Black	Total County	Black	Total County
Under $5,000	75.6	38.0	37.4	16.4
$ 5,000 - $ 9,999	21.8	44.4	41.4	31.2
$10,000 - $14,999	2.5	11.9	15.4	28.7
$15,000 - $24,999	2.5	3.8	5.0	18.1
$25,000 - $49,999	2.5	1.9	0.6	4.5
$50,000 and Over	2.5	1.9	0.1	1.0

*Source: Bureau of the Census, "Detailed Social and Economic Characteristics: Texas," Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

A further examination of income classification reveals that the median family income for black families rose from $3,386 in 1960 to $6,371 in 1970, a gain of $2,985. By contrast, however, county-wide income increased almost twice as much as black income over the 1960 figure. Black family median income, in dollars and cents, is $1,300 less than the median for the county as a whole.

POVERTY

It has long been recognized that "poverty" is a socio-economic phenomenon which may be viewed within the framework of several perspectives. One viewpoint is that America has the resources to eradicate poverty and that our failure to do so is an indictment against ourselves. This perspective is humanitarian in focus and underscores the indifference exercised by our society toward less affluent people.

Another view has been called self-reserving deception. It grows from our inability or unwillingness to understand the causes of poverty. Our Protestant Ethic (free will) rugged individualism value orientation has taught us to believe that men are largely responsible for their own destinies. This is the basic perspective illustrated in the Nixonian "work ethic" phrases. This view, discussed by President Nixon in his Second Inaugural Address (1973) equates poverty with laziness despite the fact that empirical research has challenged this belief.

One view which differs from those previously stated is that it is more important to understand what impoverishment does to those who are poor. This particular perspective calls for an understanding of the psychological consequences of poverty -- damages inflicted upon the human spirit. Proponents of the "work versus welfare" ethic refuse to blame societal and institutional inadequacies for poverty; they prefer to blame the victim. Those who continue to do so fail to recognize the potential danger of "utilitarian enlightened self-respect," a view which pivots on a recognition of the disruptive-revolutionary potential of the poor.[2]

The dimensions of poverty in Houston and in Texas will be treated briefly in this document. A statistical analysis of poverty will be noted in relative, rather than absolute terms. The absence of "absoluteness" of poverty involves the inability to measure the total cost of impoverishment which would necessarily include psychological considerations.

Although the incomes of blacks and other minorities increased during the last decade, a large proportion of these groups were faced with relative deprivation when compared with whites. Disparities in black and white incomes are invariably contributed to the poverty status of many residents in Houston and Harris County. Blacks made up about 20 percent of the population of Harris County, 19.3 percent of the population of the total SMSA, and about 26 percent of the population of Houston. Despite this low representation when compared with the majority population, 49 percent of all families with incomes below the poverty level ($4,137) in Harris County were black. Comparatively speaking, one out of every four black families in Harris County live in poverty, while one in 17 white families may be classified this way. The estimated 20,000 families considered poverty-stricken manage to survive at a subsistence level approaching $2,200 on an average per year. Tables 12 and 13 give data regarding the existence of poverty in Houston and Harris County.

Table 12
POVERTY STATUS OF RESIDENTS OF HOUSTON BY RACES: 1970

All Income Levels	Total	Black	Urban	Spanish
Families	500,236	85,023	71,656	32,243
Percent receiving public assistance income.	3.5	9.0	8.6	3.9
Mean size of family........................	3.64	4.06	4.02	4.42
With related children under 18............	315,991	59,511	50,257	24,486
Mean number of related children............ under 18 years	2.32	2.69	2.66	2.75
Families with female head..................	50,460	18,879	16,234	3,237
With related children under 18 years.......	55,534	15,070	12,995	2,544
With related children under 6 years........	14,618	7,565	6,576	1,174
Percent of heads in labor force............	70.5	66.2	67.3	56.7
Family heads	500,236	85,023	71,656	32,243
Percent 65 years and over..................	8.4	9.8	8.5	5.4
Civilian male heads under 65 years.........	412,662	59,804	50,725	27,472
Percent in labor force.....................	95.7	93.2	93.7	95.7
Unrelated individuals	142,804	29,488	25,334	6,595
Percent receiving public assistance income.	5.4	10.4	9.2	4.1
Percent 65 years and over..................	23.2	22.8	20.4	13.9
Persons	1,962,422	375,064	313,202	149,064
Percent receiving social security income...	6.4	6.7	6.2	4.1
Percent 65 years and over..................	5.9	5.8	5.3	3.1
Percent receiving social security income...	72.1	63.7	62.2	66.7
Households	572,640	101,487	86,542	35,028
In owner occupied housing unit.............	337,725	48,630	38,465	15,456
Mean value of unit.........................	$17,980	$11,035	$11,715	$13,998
In renter occupied housing unit............	234,915	52,857	48,077	19,572
Mean gross rent............................	$82	$87	$85	$94
Percent lacking some or all plumbing....... facilities	2.5	8.4	4.3	2.1

Table 12
POVERTY STATUS OF RESIDENTS OF HOUSTON BY RACES: 1970 (Cont.)

All Income Levels	Total	Black	Urban	Spanish
Families	49,121	22,774	18,109	5,125
Percent of all families	9.8	26.8	25.3	15.9
Mean family income	$2,010	$2,132	$2,128	$2,436
Mean income deficit	$1,680	$1,826	$1,848	$1,751
Percent receiving public assistance income	13.4	18.8	18.6	10.5
Mean size of family	4.12	4.50	4.50	4.79
With related children under 18 years	35,261	18,244	14,781	4,348
Mean number of related children under 18 years	3.06	3.24	3.23	3.34
Families with female head	17,422	10,559	8,783	1,424
With related children under 18 years	15,270	9,518	7,993	1,335
With related children under 6 years	7,822	5,250	4,468	701
Percent of heads in labor force	59.0	59.8	60.7	43.2
Family Heads	49,121	22,774	18,109	5,125
Percent 65 years and over	16.8	14.9	12.1	7.8
Civilian male heads under 65 years	25,114	9,813	7,794	3,350
Percent in labor force	81.4	79.4	80.1	87.9

Table 13

POVERTY STATUS OF RESIDENTS OF HOUSTON IN 1969 BY RACE - 1970

	Total	Black	Spanish
Income Less Than Poverty Level			
Unrelated Individuals	45,109	14,310	2,958
% of all unrelated individuals	31.6	48.5	37.3
Mean income	$808	$774	$705
Mean income deficit	$1021	$1064	$1167
% receiving public assistance income	13.7	18.4	10.0
% 65 years and over	38.3	35.8	23.6
Persons	247,427	116,763	38,389
% of all persons	12.6	31.1	18.2
% receiving Social Security	13.2	9.7	6.3
% 65 years and over	12.6	9.1	4.5
% receiving Social Security income	71.4	63.6	71.4
Related children under 18 years	107,330	58,720	21,409
% living with both parents	52.0	41.0	69.3
Households	74,815	31,316	8,144
% of all households	13.1	30.9	17.2
In owner occupied housing units	30,497	11,633	2,574
Mean value of unit	$11,221	$9050	$9283
In renter occupied housing units	44,318	19,683	5,570
Mean gross rent	$84	$74	$74
% Lacking all or some plumbing facilities	9.4	15.1	9.4
Income Less Than 75% of Poverty Level			
Families	32,817	15,909	4,321
% of all families	6.6	18.7	9.6
Mean income deficit	$1353	$1404	$1474
Families with female head	13,369	8,250	1,354
Unrelated individuals	35,424	11,879	2,509
% of all related individuals	24.8	40.3	31.6
Mean income deficit	$766	$764	$861
Persons	168,258	82,344	23,040
% 65 years and over	12.1	9.3	5.1
Related children under 18 years	79,079	41,611	12,144
% living with both parents	43.7	33.0	59.2

Table 13

POVERTY STATUS OF RESIDENTS OF HOUSTON IN 1969 BY RACE - 1970 (Cont.)

	Total	Black	Spanish
Income Less Than 125% of Poverty Level			
Families...............................	67,137	30,533	10,371
% of all families....................	13.8	35.9	23.1
Mean income deficit..................	$1993	$2232	$2106
Families with female head............	21,384	12,551	2,075
Unrelated individuals..................	53,820	16,752	3,365
% of all unrelated individuals........	37.7	56.8	42.4
Mean income deficit..................	$1276	$1334	$1464
Persons................................	342,763	154,710	57,155
% 65 years and over..................	11.7	8.3	3.8
Related children under 18 years.......	151,605	77,648	32,043
% living with both parents...........	59.4	48.6	75.7

To be sure, poverty is an individual problem, but more than this, it is a problem which affects the community and the general society. The dimensions of poverty in Houston prior to 1970 were discussed in a report of the Houston-Harris County Economic Opportunity Organizations (now HCCA) in 1965. The report states that the major proportion of the blacks living in Houston were poor. In 1965, the HCCA indicated that 25 percent of the people in Harris County and 28 percent of the people in Houston had poverty-level incomes. Whites comprised 36 percent of the poor; Mexican-Americans totaled about 11 percent, but blacks represented 53 percent of the poverty population in the county and 59 percent of the city's poor citizens. By 1970, the percentage of the county's poor blacks had dropped to 49 percent, a decrease of about four percentage points.

The effects of the War on Poverty efforts cannot be assessed in absolute terms. From the data available, a slight decrease in the ranks of the poor did take place during the five years of the existence of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). However, the real challenge remains. It is the task of proving today and in the future that it is both possible and necessary to maintain and extend a society of opportunity to a diverse minority citizenry. The relevancy of this challenge lies in the potential preventive elements necessary to abort or at least arrest intergenerational poverty.

The proposed cuts in domestic spending by the Nixon Administration are viewed as threats to the survival of programs designed to aid the poor. The irony of criticisms launched against the continued existence of the programs lies in absurdity. It is absurd to believe and unrealistic to assume that years of deprivation can suddenly be erased in five years. The dividends from monetary and human investment will be reaped long after the program has ceased to exist.

Occupying the center stage of the most expensive inauguration in the nation's history (estimated cost of $3 to $4 million), President Nixon outlined proposals to cut funds allocated for major domestic programs, including funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity, federal subsidies for housing of the poor, lower middle, and middle classes. There was a special irony in the President's inaugural message of 1973. He emphasized world peace, use of American power and responsibilities, solving differences, faith in America, and self-reliance. He urged Americans to do more for themselves and to demand less from government. For the nation's poor, this is easier said than done. Certain blockages to upward mobility in the American economic structure in the Nation, the State, and Houston still exist. Invisible screens of discrimination in employment, housing, education, and income are apparent. The prevalence of societal difference, racist attitudes -- reflected in the general society and our basic institutional structures operate to increase the difficulty of escaping from poverty.

A recent report on the War on Poverty in Texas (The Houston Post, March 18, 1973) implies that substantial inroads have not been made in alleviating the problem for the State. "At the bottom of the economic pile in Texas are 2.5 million people who live in poverty --

one in every five Texans," the report said. A careful examination of the article cited brings into sharp focus an even more serious revelation. The massive profile on poverty shows "dry statistics and ugly facts of being poor -- overcrowded housing, inadequate health care, little or no education." What the report does not say is that these individuals who make up this profile also suffer indignities, insecurities, and anxieties because they are poor and dependent. Contrary to popular opinions, myths or stereotypes, a greater proportion of the poor and elderly are white. In an overall sense, 22 percent of the people in Texas are poor, a difference of about 13 percent when compared with the national average.

Over a third,of the poor in Texas are under 15 years of age; nearly a fifth of the poor are over 65 years of age; and of all elderly people in the state, four out of ten are poor.

A racial breakdown of the poverty population shows that roughly three-fourths of the aged and poor are white. If one further stratifies the population, it is found that the elderly poor cut across racial and ethnic backgrounds.

Myths concerning "not wanting to work" are also challenged in the analysis of the Texas poverty population. Over one-third or 38 percent, of the poor adults in Texas are employed, and 31 percent are retired. This means that an estimated 70 percent of the adult poor exist in poverty which could not be broken by virtue of gainful employment.

Disparities in education are pronounced for the poor in Texas. The average level of education among the poor is about 8 years. This average educational level is far below the median educational level for the total population. Education and income represent only a few of the many inadequacies characteristic of poor people in Houston, Texas, and the Nation. Crowded living conditions, poor health care, and the lack of skills and education are a few of the cumulative ailments plaguing the nation's poor.

In Houston, it is estimated that 80,000 working men and women are actually poor. The alarming thing about this figure is that this group represents those who are not making it out of poverty, and there are no programs planned, formulated, or in operation which can provide the necessary assistance for extricating them from their poverty status.

The latest census figures for Brazoria, Fort Bend, and Harris counties indicate that the Houston SMSA has its share of poor people. In Harris County, about 9 percent of all families are below the poverty line, with 17.7 percent of the families in Fort Bend County falling into this category; and in Brazoria, 8.4 percent of the families are below the poverty line. Black and Spanish American families are disproportionately represented among the poverty populations for the three counties. In Harris County, 25.6 percent of the black families are below the poverty level; in Fort Bend County, 42.2 percent; and in Brazoria County, about 35 percent fall below the poverty level as defined by the Bureau of the Census.

A large proportion of elderly people are poverty stricken if we measure their status according to statistics for Harris County. About one-fourth of the elderly population in Harris County is in poverty. A statistical breakdown by race shows that 44.9 percent of the elderly 65 years of age for the black population fall below the poverty level; 64.4 percent in Fort Bend County; with about 62.6 percent in Brazoria County. The latter two counties are predominantly rural and, from all indication, the rural poor are plagued with severe problems of health, housing, education, and employment. Proximity to Houston has not alleviated problems for rural blacks in adjoining counties.

The median family income for blacks in Harris County is about 57 percent of that for whites and others. The median family income for blacks in Harris County was $6,370 in 1970; for Spanish Americans, $8,372, and for whites, $11,258. It should be noted that the figure for the "Spanish American" does not reflect the true plight of Mexican-Americans in Harris County. The census definition includes Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other Spanish. The median family income of the Mexican-American is below that for Black Americans in Harris County.

Tables 14, 15, and 16 contain data on selected demographic and socio-economic characteristics for Harris, Fort Bend, and Brazoria counties. The tables following (Tables 17 through 24) are taken from the U.S. Department of Labor's, "Statistical Tables," Poverty in Houston's Central City, (Region 6, Bureau of Labor Statistics Regional Report Series No. 1, February, 1970).

TABLE 14

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE 1970 CENSUS FOR HARRIS COUNTY

	TOTAL		NEGRO		WHITE & OTHERS		SPANISH AMERICAN *	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
POPULATION:	1741912	100.000	351113	20.156	1390799	79.843	185715	10.661
EDUCATION COMPLETED:								
<9 years	213501	23.919	59221	37.309	154280	21.023	36472	49.180
9-11 years	208532	23.362	45609	28.734	162923	22.201	12309	16.597
High school	220828	24.740	33033	20.811	187795	25.590	13157	17.741
1-3 yrs. college	118858	13.316	11817	7.444	107041	14.586	6472	8.727
4 or more yrs. college	130857	14.660	9047	5.699	121810	16.598	5750	7.753
Vocational	255621		48526		207095		16615	
IN SCHOOL IN 1970:								
Pre-school	44819	8.570	9774	8.620	35045	8.557	5414	8.769
Elementary	311959	59.655	73007	64.388	238952	58.345	40852	66.173
High school	117259	22.423	23691	20.894	93568	22.846	12150	19.680
College	48896	9.350	6914	6.097	41982	10.250	3319	5.376
INCOME: < $1,000	34396	5.976	13109	12.270	21287	4.542	2979	6.286
$1,000 - $1,999	32632	5.670	10910	10.212	19255	4.108	2396	5.055
$2,000 - $2,999	28223	4.904	9832	9.203	18391	3.924	2232	4.709
$3,000 - $3,999	30404	5.283	9974	9.335	20430	4.359	2966	6.258
$4,000 - $5,999	64040	11.128	17612	16.485	46428	9.906	7080	14.939
$6,000 - $9,999	141537	24.594	28276	26.467	113261	24.167	14317	30.210
$10,000 - $14,999	135600	23.562	12582	11.777	123018	26.249	10040	21.185
$15,000 or more	108650	18.879	4539	4.248	104111	22.215	5381	11.354
Median Family Income	$10,346		$6,370		$11,258		$8,372	
Med. Per/Cap. Income	$2,747		$1,758		$3,163		$1,977	
BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:								
No. of families	40979	9.327	20123	25.603	20856	5.781	5899	14.788
Fams. w/children<6	17782	4.047	9761	12.419	8021	2.223	3304	8.282
No. of persons 65+	24270	23.651	8546	44.943	15724	18.808	1376	26.095

SOURCE: Office of the Governor, Office of Information Services.

TABLE 14

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE 1970 CENSUS FOR HARRIS COUNTY (CONT.)

	TOTAL		NEGRO		WHITE & OTHERS		SPANISH AMERICAN *	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HOUSING:								
Median monthly rent	$111		$83		$123		$87	
Med. value owner occ	$14,870		$10,475		$16,092		$11,640	
TRANSPORT. TO WORK:								
Private auto	609955	86.853	96125	74.758	513830	89.564	53065	83.415
Public trans.	42038	5.985	23867	18.561	18171	3.167	5351	8.411
Other	50285	7.160	8589	6.679	41696	7.267	5199	8.172
OCCUPATIONS:								
Professional, Tech.	120119	16.411	10519	7.656	109600	18.434	6360	9.655
Managers & admin.	63166	8.630	2960	2.154	60206	10.126	3333	5.060
Clerical & sales	201112	27.477	18239	13.275	182873	30.759	14859	22.558
Craftsmen & foremen	103710	14.169	12883	9.376	90827	15.277	11333	17.205
Semi-skilled	220967	30.190	86079	62.652	134888	22.688	27962	42.450
Farm workers	2675	.365	692	.503	1983	.333	257	.390
Experienced unemployed	20167	2.755	6019	4.380	14148	2.379	1765	2.679

* Included in 'White & Others', see definitions.

TABLE 15

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE 1970 CENSUS FOR FORT BEND COUNTY

	TOTAL		NEGRO		WHITE & OTHERS		SPANISH AMERICAN *	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
POPULATION:	52314	100.000	8854	16.924	43460	83.075	13890	26.551
EDUCATION COMPLETED:								
< 9 years	11536	45.335	2314	57.305	9222	43.077	3913	78.922
9-11 years	5123	20.132	1032	25.557	4091	19.109	524	10.568
High school	5266	20.694	559	13.843	4707	21.987	354	7.139
1-3 yrs. college	1920	7.545	108	2.674	1812	8.464	90	1.815
4 or more yrs. col.	1601	6.291	25	.619	1576	7.361	77	1.553
Vocational	5424		755		4669		663	
IN SCHOOL IN 1970:								
Pre-school	678	4.525	125	4.657	553	4.497	218	4.645
Elementary	10163	67.839	1737	64.716	8426	68.520	3555	75.751
High school	3616	24.137	772	28.763	2844	23.127	881	18.772
College	524	3.497	50	1.862	474	3.854	39	.831
INCOME: < $1,000	1050	7.346	434	18.483	616	5.156	155	5.711
$1,000 - $1,999	1155	8.080	431	18.356	603	5.048	181	6.669
$2,000 - $2,999	948	6.632	284	12.095	664	5.558	165	6.079
$3,000 - $3,999	870	6.086	205	8.730	665	5.567	199	7.332
$4,000 - $5,999	1775	12.418	304	12.947	1471	12.314	569	20.965
$6,000 - $9,999	4041	28.272	522	22.231	3519	29.460	897	33.050
$10,000 - $14,999	2942	20.583	132	5.621	2810	23.524	420	15.475
$15,000 or more	1512	10.578	36	1.533	1476	12.356	128	4.716
Median Fam. Income	$8,183		$4,258		$8,833		$6,547	
Med. per/cap. income	$1,424		$754		$1,713		$804	
BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:								
No. of families	2149	17.731	741	42.102	1408	13.590	745	29.622
Fams. w/children <6	771	5.361	264	15.000	507	4.893	438	17.415
No. of persons 65+	1560	39.989	549	64.436	1011	33.158	199	52.785

TABLE 15

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE 1970 CENSUS FOR FORT BEND COUNTY (CONT.)

	TOTAL		NEGRO		WHITE & OTHERS		SPANISH AMERICAN *	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HOUSING:								
Median monthly rent	$71		$48		$79		$62	
Med. value owner occ	$12,822		$6,697		$13,970		$9,125	
TRANSPORT. TO WORK:								
Private auto	15247	86.102	1967	80.220	13280	87.047	3298	87.456
Public trans.	72	.406	26	1.060	46	.301	14	.371
Other	2389	13.491	459	18.719	1930	12.650	459	12.171
OCCUPATIONS:								
Professional, Tech.	1829	10.002	71	2.759	1758	11.188	142	3.648
Managers & admin.	1287	7.038	76	2.953	1211	7.707	83	2.132
Clerical & sales	3263	17.845	181	7.034	3082	19.615	366	9.403
Craftsmen & foremen	3015	16.488	202	7.850	2813	17.903	620	15.930
Semi-skilled	7079	38.714	1729	67.197	5350	34.050	2268	58.273
Farm workers	1414	7.733	217	8.433	1197	7.618	296	7.605
Experienced unemployed	398	2.176	97	3.769	301	1.915	117	3.006

* Included in 'White & Others', see definitions.

SOURCE: Office of the Governor, Office of Information Services.

TABLE 16

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE 1970 CENSUS FOR BRAZORIA COUNTY

	TOTAL		NEGRO		WHITE & OTHERS		SPANISH AMERICAN *	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
POPULATION:	108312	100.000	10725	9.901	97587	90.098	10769	9.942
EDUCATION COMPLETED:								
9 years	13676	24.433	2769	53.147	10907	21.486	2487	59.157
9-11 years	12441	22.227	1354	25.988	11087	21.841	549	13.058
High school	17512	31.287	813	15.604	16699	32.896	710	16.888
1-3 yrs. college	6754	12.066	161	3.090	6593	12.988	264	6.279
4 or more yrs. col.	5589	9.985	113	2.168	5476	10.787	194	4.614
Vocational	15378		1216		14162		702	
IN SCHOOL IN 1970:								
Pre-school	2179	6.612	203	7.060	1976	6.570	200	5.635
Elementary	20554	62.377	1809	62.921	18745	62.325	2429	68.441
High school	8106	24.600	745	25.913	7361	24.474	802	22.597
College	2112	6.409	118	4.104	1994	6.629	118	3.324
INCOME: < $1,000	1569	4.960	434	16.906	1135	3.905	156	6.652
$1,000 - $1,999	1607	5.080	426	16.595	1064	3.660	62	2.643
$2,000 - $2,999	1426	4.508	280	10.907	1146	3.943	117	4.989
$3,000 - $3,999	1255	3.967	188	7.323	1067	3.671	201	8.571
$4,000 - $5,999	2797	8.842	470	18.309	2327	8.006	405	17.270
$6,000 - $9,000	7900	24.975	596	23.217	7304	25.130	757	32.281
$10,000 - $14,999	9984	31.563	139	5.414	9845	33.873	462	19.701
$15,000 or more	5093	16.101	34	1.324	5059	17.406	185	7.889
Median fam. income	$10,434		$5,071		$10,750		$7,839	
Med. per/cap. income	$1,681		$586		$1,972		$931	
BELOW POVERTY LEVEL:								
No. of families	2267	8.403	651	35.037	1616	6.433	338	16.691
Fams w/children < 6	786	2.913	261	14.047	525	2.090	160	7.901
No. of persons 65+	1829	31.280	561	62.611	1268	25.610	110	33.639

TABLE 16

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE 1970 CENSUS FOR BRAZORIA COUNTY (CONT.)

	TOTAL		NEGRO		WHITE & OTHERS		SPANISH AMERICAN *	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HOUSING:								
Median monthly rent	$89		$50		$93		$77	
Med. value owner occ	$13,292		$5,785		$13,910		$9,350	
TRANSPORT. TO WORK:								
Private auto	35090	89.771	2338	86.721	32752	89.997	2697	82.477
Public Trans.	125	.319	53	1.965	72	.197	13	.397
Other	3873	9.908	305	11.313	3568	9.804	560	17.125
OCCUPATIONS:								
Professional, Tech.	6441	15.759	127	4.128	6314	16.706	252	7.553
Managers & admin.	3054	7.472	85	2.763	2969	7.855	98	2.937
Clerical & sales	6811	16.665	84	2.730	6727	17.799	325	9.742
Craftsmen & foremen	8569	20.966	214	6.957	8355	22.106	616	18.465
Semi-skilled	14088	34.470	2211	71.879	11877	31.425	1854	55.575
Farm workers	848	2.074	150	4.876	698	1.846	102	3.057
Experienced unemployed	1059	2.591	205	6.664	854	2.259	89	2.667

* Included in 'White & Others', see definitions.

SOURCE: Office of the Governor, Office of Information Services.

Table 17
Employment Status by Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	TOTAL	BLACK	WHITE	
			Spanish American	Other White
Both Sexes, 16 Years and Over				
Civilian noninstitutional population	82,200	51,400	17,300	13,500
Civilian labor force.............	54,500	35,800	10,700	8,000
Civilian Labor force participation rate...........................	66.3	69.6	61.8	59.3
Employed.......................	50,000	32,300	10,000	7,600
Full time....................	35,000	21,900	7,400	5,700
Part time....................	11,800	8,300	2,000	1,400
With job but not working......	3,100	2,100	600	400
Unemployed......................	4,500	3,400	700	400
Unemployment rate...................	8.3	9.5	6.5	5.0
Not in labor force..................	27,700	15,600	6,600	5,500
Men, 20 Years and Over				
Civilian noninstitutional population	34,000	20,500	7,200	6,300
Civilian labor force.............	28,400	17,100	6,500	4,800
Civilian labor force participation rate...........................	83.5	83.4	90.3	76.2
Employed.......................	27,400	16,400	6,400	4,600
Full time	21,100	12,400	5,100	3,600
Part time....................	4,500	2,800	1,000	700
Unemployed	1,000	700	100	200
Unemployment rate	3.5	4.1	1.5	4.2
Not in labor force	5,600	3,400	700	1,500
Women, 20 Years and Over				
Civilian noninstitutional population	38,800	25,300	7,300	6,300
Civilian labor force	20,800	15,500	2,700	2,600
Civilian labor force participation rate	53.6	61.3	37.0	41.3
Employed	18,900	14,000	2,500	2,400
Full time	11,800	8,400	1,700	1,800
Part time	5,800	4,700	600	500
Unemployed	1,800	1,500	200	100
Unemployment rate	8.7	9.7	7.4	3.8
Not in labor force	18,000	9,800	4,600	3,700
Both Sexes, 16-19 Years				
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,400	5,600	2,800	1,000
Civilian labor force	5,300	3,200	1,500	700
Civilian labor force participation rate	56.4	57.1	53.6	70.0
Employed	3,700	2,000	1,200	500
Full time....................	2,000	1,100	600	300
Part time....................	1,500	900	500	200
Unemployed.....................	1,600	1,200	300	100
Unemployment rate	30.2	37.5	20.0	14.3
Not in labor force	4,100	2,400	1,300	300

Table 18
Employment Status of Men Aged 20-64 Years, By Marital Status and Ethnic Group

MARITAL STATUS	POPULATION	LABOR FORCE					NOT IN LABOR FORCE
		TOTAL		EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED		
		Number	Percent of Population		Number	Percent of Labor Force	
All Men							
Single	4,800	4,100	85.4	3,800	200	4.9	700
Married wife present	17,800	16,700	93.8	16,300	400	2.4	1,000
Married wife absent .	3,400	3,200	94.1	3,000	100	3.1	200
Widowed or divorced .	3,700	3,100	83.8	2,900	200	6.5	600
Negro							
Single	2,600	2,300	88.5	2,100	200	8.7	300
Married wife present	10,300	9,600	93.2	9,300	300	3.1	700
Married wife absent .	2,600	2,300	88.5	2,200	100	4.3	200
Widowed or divorced .	2,300	2,000	87.0	1,900	100	5.0	300
Spanish American							
Single	700	600	(3)	600	0	(3)	100
Married wife present	5,000	4,800	96.0	4,700	100	2.1	200
Married wife absent .	700	700	(3)	700	0	(3)	0
Widowed or divorced .	300	200	(3)	200	0	(3)	0
Other White							
Single	1,400	1,100	78.6	1,100	0	0.0	200
Married wife present	2,500	2,300	92.0	2,200	100	4.3	200
Married wife absent .	200	200	(3)	200	0	(3)	0
Widowed or divorced .	1,100	800	72.7	800	100	(3)	200

(3) Percent distribution is not shown where base of percentage is 1,000 or below.

Table 19
Employment Status of Women Aged 20-64 Years, By Marital Status and Ethnic Group

MARITAL STATUS	POPULATION	LABOR FORCE					NOT IN LABOR FORCE
		TOTAL		EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED		
		Number	Percent of Population		Number	Percent of Labor Force	
All Women							
Single.........	3,600	2,800	77.8	2,500	300	10.7	800
Married husband present......	18,100	8,900	49.2	7,900	1,000	11.2	9,200
Married husband absent.......	4,000	3,200	80.0	2,900	300	9.4	800
Widowed or divorced.....	6,700	4,800	71.6	4,600	200	4.2	1,900
Negro							
Single	2,500	1,800	72.0	1,600	300	16.7	700
Married husband present......	10,600	6,400	60.4	5,700	800	12.5	4,200
Married husband absent	3,500	2,900	82.9	2,600	300	10.3	600
Widowed or divorced.....	4,900	3,500	71.4	3,400	100	2.9	1,400
Spanish American							
Single	700	600	(3)	600	0	(3)	100
Married husband present......	4,900	1,500	30.6	1,300	200	13.3	3,500
Married husband absent.......	300	100	(3)	100	0	(3)	200
Widowed or divorced	700	400	(3)	400	0	(3)	300
Other White							
Single	400	400	(3)	400	0	(3)	100
Married husband present......	2,600	1,000	38.5	900	100	10.0	1,600
Married husband absent	200	100	(3)	100	0	(3)	0
Widowed or divorced	1,100	800	72.7	800	0	(3)	300

(3) Percent distribution is not shown where base of percentage is 1,000 or below.

Table 20
Employment Status of Men by Age, Educational Attainment, and Ethnic Group

YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED	POPULATION	LABOR FORCE					NOT IN LABOR FORCE
		TOTAL		EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED		
		Number	Percent of Population		Number	Percent of Labor Force	
MEN 16-34 YEARS							
All Men	15,100	13,100	86.8	12,000	1,100	8.4	2,000
No school years completed	100	100	(3)	100	0	(3)	0
Elementary: 1-8 years....	3,800	3,300	86.8	3,000	300	9.1	400
High school: 1-4 years .	9,600	8,400	87.5	7,700	700	8.3	1,300
College: 1 or more years	1,500	1,200	80.0	1,200	100	8.3	200
Median years completed ..	10.8	10.9	...	10.9	10.4	...	10.7
Negro	9,000	7,800	86.7	7,000	800	10.3	1,200
No school years completed	100	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	0
Elementary: 1-8 years ..	1,300	1,100	84.6	1,000	100	9.1	100
High school: 1-4 years .	6,600	5,800	87.9	5,200	600	10.3	800
College: 1 or more years	1,000	900	(3)	800	100	(3)	100
Median years completed ..	11.2	11.4	...	11.4	11.2	...	10.9
Spanish American	4,200	3,700	88.1	3,500	200	5.4	500
No school years completed	0	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	0
Elementary: 1-8 years ..	2,000	1,900	95.0	1,800	0	0.0	100
High school: 1-4 years .	2,000	1,700	85.0	1,600	100	5.9	300
College: 1 or more years	100	100	(3)	100	0	(3)	0
Median years completed ..	9.2	8.8	...	8.8	0	...	10.4
Other White	1,800	1,600	88.9	1,500	100	6.3	300
No school years completed	0	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	0
Elementary: 1-8 years ..	400	300	(3)	200	0	(3)	0
High school: 1-4 years .	1,100	1,000	90.9	900	0	(3)	100
College: 1 or more years	400	300	(3)	300	0	(3)	100
Median years completed ..	11.4	12.0	...	12.2	0	...	12.5

(3) Percent distribution is not shown where base of percentage is 1,000 or below.

Table 20
Employment Status of Men by Age, Educational Attainment, and Ethnic Group--Continued

YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED	POPULATION	LABOR FORCE					NOT IN LABOR FORCE
		TOTAL		EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED		
		Number	Percent of Population		Number	Percent of Labor Force	
MEN 35 YEARS AND OVER							
All Men	23,100	18,100	78.4	17,600	600	3.3	5,000
No school years completed .	1,600	800	50.0	800	0	(3)	800
Elementary: 1-8 years.....	12,200	9,100	74.6	9,000	200	2.2	3,000
High school: 1-4 years....	7,400	6,400	86.5	6,200	200	3.1	900
College: 1 or more years..	2,000	1,700	85.0	1,600	100	5.9	300
Median years completed	8.1	8.5	...	8.4	12.0	...	5.9
Negro	14,000	10,900	77.9	10,500	400	3.7	3,100
No school years completed .	600	200	(3)	200	0	(3)	400
Elementary: 1-8 years.....	7,300	5,200	71.2	5,100	200	3.8	2,000
High school: 1-4 years....	4,800	4,400	91.7	4,200	200	4.5	400
College: 1 or more years .	1,400	1,100	78.6	1,100	0	0.0	200
Median years completed	8.4	9.0	...	8.9	9.0	...	5.8
Spanish American	4,200	3,600	85.7	3,600	0	0.0	600
No school years completed .	800	500	62.5	500	0	0.0	300
Elementary: 1-8 years.....	2,600	2,400	92.3	2,400	0	0.0	200
High school: 1-4 years ...	700	500	(3)	500	0	(3)	0
College: 1 or more years..	100	100	(3)	100	0	(3)	0
Median years completed	4.6	5.3	...	5.3	0	...	1.0
Other White	4,900	3,600	73.5	3,400	200	5.6	1,300
No school years completed .	200	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	100
Elementary: 1-8 years.....	2,300	1,600	69.6	1,500	0	0.0	800
High school: 1-4 years....	1,900	1,500	78.9	1,400	0	0.0	400
College: 1 or more years .	500	500	(3)	400	0	(3)	100
Median years completed	8.8	9.6	...	9.7	0	...	7.5

(3) Percent distribution is not shown where base of percentage is 1,000 or below.

Table 21
Employment Status of Women by Age, Educational Attainment, and Ethnic Group

YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED	POPULATION	LABOR FORCE TOTAL		LABOR FORCE EMPLOYED	LABOR FORCE UNEMPLOYED		NOT IN LABOR FORCE
		Number	Percent of Population		Number	Percent of Labor Force	
WOMEN 16-34 YEARS							
All Women	17,600	10,400	59.1	8,100	2,300	22.1	7,300
No school years completed.	0	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	0
Elementary: 1-8 years....	3,700	1,500	40.5	1,100	300	20.0	2,100
High school: 1-4 years...	12,100	7,600	62.8	5,900	1,800	23.7	4,500
College: 1 or more years.	1,800	1,300	72.2	1,100	200	15.4	600
Median years completed....	11.1	11.8	...	12.1	11.1	...	10.4
Negro	11,700	7,600	65.0	5,800	1,800	23.7	4,100
No school years completed.	0	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	0
Elementary: 1-8 years....	1,300	700	53.8	500	200	(3)	700
High school: 1-4 years...	8,700	5,800	66.7	4,300	1,400	24.1	2,900
College: 1 or more years.	1,600	1,100	68.8	900	200	18.2	500
Median years completed....	11.7	12.0	...	12.1	11.3	...	11.0
Spanish American	4,500	1,900	42.2	1,600	400	21.1	2,600
No school years completed.	0	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	0
Elementary: 1-8 years....	2,000	700	35.0	500	200	(3)	1,300
High school: 1-4 years...	2,400	1,200	50.0	1,000	200	16.7	1,300
College: 1 or more years.	100	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	0
Median years completed....	9.5	10.2	...	10.7	9.0	...	9.0
Other White	1,400	800	57.1	700	100	(3)	600
No school years completed.	0	0	(3)	0	0	(3)	0
Elementary: 1-8 years....	300	100	(3)	100	0	(3)	200
High school: 1-4 years...	900	600	(3)	500	0	(3)	300
College: 1 or more years.	200	100	(3)	100	0	(3)	100
Median years completed....	12.0	12.2	...	12.1	0	...	10.5

Table 21
Employment Status of Women by Age, Educational Attainment, and Ethnic Group--Continued

YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED	POPULATION	LABOR FORCE					NOT IN LABOR FORCE
		TOTAL		EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED		
		Number	Percent of Population		Number	Percent of Labor Force	
WOMEN 35 YEARS AND OVER							
All Women	26,400	12,900	48.9	12,300	600	4.7	13,400
No school years completed	1,900	400	21.1	400	0	(3)	1,500
Elementary: 1-8 years...	12,700	5,100	40.2	4,900	200	3.9	7,500
High school: 1-4 years..	10,000	6,300	63.0	5,900	300	4.8	3,800
College: 1 or more years	1,800	1,200	66.7	1,100	0	0.0	600
Median years completed...	8.4	9.7	...	9.6	10.5	...	7.1
Negro	16,700	9,500	56.9	9,000	400	4.2	7,200
No school years completed	600	200	3	200	0	(3)	400
Elementary: 1-8 years...	7,800	3,600	46.2	3,600	100	2.8	4,000
High school: 1-4 years..	6,900	4,700	68.1	4,400	300	6.4	2,300
College: 1 or more years	1,400	900	64.3	900	0	(3)	500
Median years completed...	8.9	9.9	...	9.7	10.5	...	8.0
Spanish American	4,300	1,400	32.6	1,400	100	7.1	2,800
No school years completed	1,100	200	18.2	200	0	(3)	900
Elementary: 1-8 years...	2,600	800	30.8	800	0	(3)	1,700
High school: 1-4 years..	600	400	3	400	0	(3)	200
College: 1 or more years	0	0	3	0	0	(3)	0
Median years completed...	4.4	6.7	...	6.7	0	...	3.2
Other White	5,400	2,000	37.0	2,000	100	5.0	3,400
No school years completed	200	0	3	0	0	(3)	200
Elementary: 1-8 years...	2,400	600	25.0	600	0	(3)	1,800
High school: 1-4 years..	2,500	1,200	48.0	1,100	0	0.0	1,300
College: 1 or more years	300	300	3	300	0	(3)	100
Median years completed...	9.2	10.9	...	11.3	0	...	8.4

(3) Percent distribution is not shown where base of percentage is 1,000 or below.

Table 22
Unemployment During Previous Year by Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex

(Percent distribution)

WEEKS OF UNEMPLOYMENT	TOTAL	BLACK	WHITE	
			Spanish American	Other White
Both Sexes, 16 Years and Over				
Total working or looking for work	62,100	41,000	12,300	8,900
Percent with unemployment........	24.6	26.6	23.6	18.0
Total with unemployment:				
Number...................	15,300	10,900	2,900	1,600
Percent..................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1-4 weeks....................	51.0	48.6	56.7	53.3
5-14 weeks...................	27.5	26.6	26.7	33.3
15-26 weeks..................	13.1	15.6	10.0	6.7
27 weeks or more.............	8.5	9.2	6.7	6.7
Men, 20 Years and Over				
Total working or looking for work	29,700	17,800	6,800	5,100
Percent with unemployment........	17.2	18.5	14.7	15.7
Total with unemployment:				
Number...................	5,100	3,300	1,000	800
Percent..................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1-4 weeks....................	46.2	46.9	(3)	(3)
5-14 weeks...................	26.9	25.0	(3)	(3)
15-26 weeks..................	17.3	18.8	(3)	(3)
27 weeks or more.............	9.6	9.4	(3)	(3)
Women, 20 Years and Over				
Total working or looking for work	24,900	18,400	3,600	2,900
Percent with unemployment	24.1	25.5	25.0	13.8
Total with unemployment:				
Number...................	6,000	4,700	900	400
Percent..................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1-4 weeks....................	49.2	46.8	(3)	(3)
5-14 weeks...................	29.5	29.8	(3)	(3)
15-26 weeks..................	11.5	12.8	(3)	(3)
27 weeks or more.............	9.8	10.6	(3)	(3)
Both Sexes, 16-19 Years				
Total working or looking for work	7,600	4,800	2,000	800
Percent with unemployment........	55.3	60.4	50.0	50.0
Total with unemployment:				
Number...................	4,200	2,900	1,000	400
Percent..................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1-4 weeks....................	57.1	53.3	(3)	(3)
5-14 weeks...................	23.8	23.3	(3)	(3)
15-26 weeks..................	11.9	13.3	(3)	(3)
27 weeks or more.............	7.1	10.0	(3)	(3)

(3) Percent distribution is not shown where base of percentage is 1,000 or below.

Table 23
Employed Persons By Industry Group, Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex

(Percent distribution)

INDUSTRY GROUP	Men, 20 Years and over				Women, 20 Years and over			
			WHITE				WHITE	
	TOTAL	BLACK	Spanish American	Other White	TOTAL	BLACK	Spanish American	Other White
Number..................	27,400	16,400	6,400	4,600	18,900	14,000	2,500	2,400
Percent.................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Wage and Salary Workers	94.4	94.8	96.6	89.8	93.8	94.7	93.1	89.4
Private...............	87.1	87.3	90.9	80.8	82.1	82.3	83.5	78.9
Agriculture.........	1.3	1.7	.7	.5	.1	0.0	0.0	.5
Mining..............	.8	.7	.6	1.1	.2	.1	.5	.5
Construction........	15.3	15.8	18.2	9.6	.2	.1	0.0	1.0
Manufacturing.......	23.2	20.5	32.9	19.0	6.5	3.0	19.0	14.0
Transportation and Public Utilities..	11.4	12.1	7.2	14.9	1.9	.9	1.4	7.6
Wholesale and Retail	19.9	22.5	15.3	15.4	19.4	16.6	28.4	26.6
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate...	2.3	2.5	1.7	2.4	2.3	1.4	4.9	4.6
Service Industries..	13.0	11.5	13.2	17.9	51.5	60.2	29.4	24.1
Business and Repair..........	5.2	3.4	6.0	10.4	1.6	1.0	4.9	1.6
Private Households	.8	1.3	.2	0.0	27.7	35.1	6.4	6.2
Personal Service.. (Not Households)	3.3	2.7	4.5	4.1	10.2	11.7	6.8	5.0
Educational.......	.3	.1	.6	.3	1.5	1.6	0.0	2.6
Medical and Hospital........	.9	1.0	.6	1.2	8.6	8.7	9.9	5.8
All Other.........	2.4	2.9	1.5	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.4	2.0
Government..........	7.3	7.5	5.7	9.0	11.8	12.4	9.6	10.5
Self-Employed...........	5.5	5.0	3.4	10.2	5.5	4.7	6.9	8.6
Unpaid Family Workers...	.1	.1	0.0	0.0	.7	.6	0.0	2.0

Table 24

Employed Persons by Occupation, Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex

(Percent distribution)

OCCUPATION	Men, 20 Years and over				Women, 20 Years and over			
			WHITE				WHITE	
	TOTAL	BLACK	Spanish American	Other White	TOTAL	BLACK	Spanish American	Other White
Number	27,400	16,400	6,400	4,600	18,900	14,000	2,500	2,400
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White-Collar Workers	15.0	13.8	8.9	27.3	25.9	19.0	35.3	56.1
Professional and Technical	3.5	2.8	2.4	7.7	5.9	5.6	3.8	9.7
Managers	4.3	4.1	1.3	8.9	3.0	2.0	5.4	5.6
Clerical Workers	5.9	5.8	4.1	9.1	14.2	9.4	23.2	33.1
Sales Workers	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.5	2.8	2.1	2.9	6.6
Blue-Collar Workers	72.1	71.4	81.1	62.2	15.3	12.9	30.2	13.9
Craftsmen and Foremen	18.8	12.9	25.8	30.1	1.0	.8	1.4	1.5
Carpenters and Construction	7.0	5.3	9.4	10.0	.1	.1	0.0	0.0
Mechanics and Repairmen	5.0	3.9	6.3	7.5	.2	.2	0.0	.5
All Other	6.7	3.8	10.2	12.7	.7	.5	1.4	1.0
Operatives	32.4	34.0	34.3	24.3	13.7	11.4	28.3	11.9
Drivers and Deliverymen	10.9	13.5	6.1	8.2	.5	.6	.5	0.0
Laundry and Dry Cleaning	.9	1.2	.8	0.0	5.1	6.3	1.9	1.5
All Others	20.6	19.2	27.5	16.1	8.0	4.5	25.9	10.4
Nonfarm Laborers	20.9	24.5	20.9	7.8	.7	.8	.5	.5
Service Workers	12.3	13.9	9.8	10.2	58.8	68.0	34.4	30.1
Private Household	0.0	.1	0.0	0.0	27.4	35.0	6.4	5.2
Other Service Workers	12.3	13.8	9.8	10.2	31.3	33.0	28.0	24.9
Charwomen, janitors and Porters	5.5	7.9	3.1	.4	1.6	.5	6.3	3.1
Waiters, Cooks and Bartenders	2.7	3.0	2.9	1.4	9.3	9.8	6.7	8.9
Kitchen Helpers	.8	.7	1.1	.9	2.3	2.8	1.4	.5
Protective	1.2	.3	1.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Other	2.2	2.0	1.7	3.3	18.1	19.9	13.6	12.4
Farm Workers	.6	.9	.2	.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

SUBSIDY VS. WELFARE

The Texas Office of Economic Opportunity report indicated that there were 2.5 million Texans who were below the poverty line in 1971. These individuals, in the main, were children and older people. They were predominantly black and Mexican-American, and most were not on welfare.

A Houston Chronicle (April 3, 1973) report revealed that more government funds are channeled into farm subsidies than welfare. "Texas landowners received $525 million last year in agriculture subsidy payments from the United States government, more than the state received in federal welfare funds," the report said. Fifteen persons and two state agencies, including the Texas Department of Corrections, were paid more than $100,000 each. The Texas Department of Corrections received $553,813 in incentive payments for not growing crops. Total agriculture subsidies for Texas amounted to $525.7 million; the Department of Public Welfare received only $462.5 million for public assistance payments and program administration from the federal government. A substantial proportion of the funds received are allocated for disability payments and assistance for children and the aged.

Black Representative Barbara Jordan, a freshman Democratic House member from Houston, Texas, questioned the imbalance in federal payments. "I recognize that the farmer needs help, but at this point in time of rising food costs and rising prices we still see that the farmer comes in for protection by the federal government," she said. The dynamic and able Congresswoman went further in her concern. She said that "though Nixon has moved to cut social service programs sharply, saying that cuts would fight inflation, he has not made the definitive proposal on farm subsidies which could have the same effect on the economy." (Houston Chronicle, April 4, 1973.)

EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATIONAL DATA

Unemployment and Underemployment: Houston

The best data on unemployment and subemployment in Houston were compiled by a report of the United States Department of Labor and published in 1971. The information contained in the Urban Employment Survey covered about 26 percent of the black civilian force in the total SMSA.

"As is the case nationally, the aggregate unemployment figures for the Houston Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area conceal the high concentration of unemployment in the central city areas and in the minority labor force."[3] The findings for Houston are presented in Tables 25 through 31; the statistics include information for selected years, 1967-1969.

The nonwhite unemployment rate included in the tables is about 99 percent black since the Spanish surname category is included in the white rate. From the data presented, it appears that the black labor

Table 25
ANNUAL MONEY INCOME BY ETHNIC GROUP AND FAMILY STATUS IN THE "ORIGINAL CEP AREA" OF THE HOUSTON LABOR MARKET, JULY 1968-JUNE 1969

(Percent distribution)

Money Income	Total	Black	Mexican American	Anglo
Families (2 or more members)				
Total: Number	28,400	18,400	6,100	4,000
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$0 to $3,499	28.9	35.3	16.7	19.5
$3,500 to $4,999	18.3	17.9	20.0	14.6
$5,000 to $7,999	30.3	28.8	35.0	31.7
$8,000 to $9,999	10.6	8.7	13.3	14.6
$10,000 or more	12.0	9.2	15.0	19.5
Median income	$5,200	$4,700	$6,000	$6,600
Families (4 or more members)				
Total: Number	13,100	8,300	3,900	1,100
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$0 to $3,499	21.2	28.8	10.3	21.4
$3,500 to $4,999	16.7	16.3	15.4	14.3
$5,000 to $7,999	32.6	31.3	35.9	14.3
$8,000 to $9,999	12.9	11.3	17.9	21.4
$10,000 or more	16.7	12.5	20.5	28.6
Median income	$6,000	$5,400	$6,800	$8,000
Unrelated individuals				
Total: Number	16,700	10,600	1,500	4,500
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$0 to $3,499	66.7	71.4	73.3	56.8
$3,500 to $4,999	16.1	15.2	20.0	20.5
$5,000 to $7,999	12.5	10.5	6.7	15.9
$8,000 to $9,999	2.4	1.9	0	2.3
$10,000 or more	2.4	1.0	0	4.5
Median income	$2,300	$2,200	$2,400	$3,100

Note: The figures for Mexican Americans include "other Spanish surname Americans" used in Bureau of Labor Statistics tables. Sums of individual items may not equal totals because of rounding.

Source: Urban Employment Survey for July 1968-June 1969, U.S. Department of Labor.

Table 26
ESTIMATED UNEMPLOYMENT LEVELS AND RATES IN HOUSTON SMSA AND CENTRAL CITY AREA, ANNUAL AVERAGES, 1967 THROUGH 1969

Category	Total	White	Black and other Races
Unemployment SMSA			
Level:			
1967	22,000	13,000	9,000
1968	22,000	14,000	8,000
1969	23,000	13,000	9,000
Rate:			
1967	3.3	2.4	6.3
1968	3.3	2.6	5.7
1969	3.2	2.3	6.7
Unemployment central city			
Level:			
1967	20,000	11,000	9,000
1968	18,000	9,000	8,000
1969	17,000	8,000	9,000
Rate:			
1967	3.7	2.7	6.3
1968	3.4	2.5	5.8
1969	3.3	2.1	6.6

Note: In this table only, the SMSA definition is that used by the State employment security agency based upon 1960 definitions of the SMSA. Hence, the SMSA is Harris County alone. Sums of individual items may not equal totals because of rounding.

Source: Manpower Report of the President, 1968, Manpower Report of the President, 1970, and Employment and Earnings, April 1970, p.5.

Table 27
EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY ETHNIC GROUP, AGE, AND SEX IN THE "ORIGINAL CEP AREA" OF THE HOUSTON LABOR MARKET, JULY 1968-JUNE 1969

Employment status	Total	Black	Mexican American	Anglo
Both sexes, 16 years and over				
Civilian noninstitutional population......	82,200	51,400	17,300	13,500
Civilian labor force..................	54,500	35,800	10,700	8,000
Civilian labor force participation rate	66.3	69.6	61.8	59.3
Employed..........................	50,000	32,300	10,000	7,600
Full time......................	35,000	21,900	7,400	5,700
Part time......................	11,800	8,300	2,000	1,400
With job but not working.........	3,100	2,100	600	400
Unemployed........................	4,500	3,400	700	400
Unemployment rate....................	8.3	9.5	6.5	5.0
Not in labor force...................	27,700	15,600	6,600	5,500
Men, 20 years and over				
Civilian noninstitutional population......	34,000	20,500	7,200	6,300
Civilian labor force..................	28,400	17,100	6,500	4,800
Civilian labor force participation rate	83.5	83.4	90.3	76.2
Employed..........................	*27,400	*16,400	* 6,400	* 4,600
Full time......................	21,100	12,400	5,100	3,600
Part time......................	4,500	2,800	1,000	700
Unemployed........................	1,000	700	100	200
Unemployment rate....................	3.5	4.1	1.5	4.2
Not in labor force...................	5,600	3,400	700	1,500
Women, 20 years and over				
Civilian noninstitutional population......	38,800	25,300	7,300	6,300
Civilian labor force..................	20,800	15,500	2,700	2,600
Civilian labor force participation rate	53.6	61.3	37.0	41.3
Employed..........................	* 18,900	* 14,000	* 2,500	* 2,400
Full time......................	11,800	8,400	1,700	1,800
Part time......................	5,800	4,700	600	500
Unemployed........................	1,800	1,500	200	100
Unemployment rate....................	8.7	9.7	7.4	3.8
Not in labor force...................	18,000	9,800	4,600	3,700
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years				
Civilian noninstitutional population......	9,400	5,600	2,800	1,000
Civilian labor force..................	5,300	3,200	1,500	700
Civilian labor force participation rate	56.4	57.1	53.6	70.0
Employed..........................	* 3,700	* 2,000	* 1,200	* 500
Full time......................	2,000	1,100	600	300
Part time......................	1,500	900	500	200
Unemployed........................	1,600	1,200	300	100
Unemployment rate....................	30.2	37.5	20.0	14.3
Not in labor force...................	4,100	2,400	1,300	300

*Includes "with job but not working," not shown separately.

Note: Sums of individual items may not equal totals because of rounding.

Source: Urban Employment Survey, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 28
UNEMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE DURING PREVIOUS YEAR BY ETHNIC GROUP, AGE, AND SEX IN THE "ORIGINAL CEP AREA" OF THE HOUSTON LABOR MARKET, JULY 1968-JUNE 1969

(Percent distribution)

Weeks of unemployment	Total	Black	Mexican American	Anglo
Both sexes, 16 years and over				
Total working or looking for work.	62,100	41,000	12,300	8,900
Percent with unemployment.........	24.6	26.6	23.6	18.0
Total with unemployment: Number..	15,300	10,900	2,900	1,600
Percent.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1 to 4 weeks................	51.0	48.6	56.7	53.3
5 to 14 weeks...............	27.5	26.6	26.7	33.3
15 to 26 weeks..............	13.1	15.6	10.0	6.7
27 weeks or more............	8.5	9.2	6.7	6.7
Men, 20 years and over				
Total working or looking for work.	29,700	17,800	6,800	5,100
Percent with unemployment.........	17.2	18.5	14.7	15.7
Total with unemployment: Number..	5,100	3,300	1,000	800
Percent.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1 to 4 weeks................	46.2	46.9	(*)	(*)
5 to 14 weeks...............	26.9	25.0	(*)	(*)
15 to 26 weeks..............	17.3	18.8	(*)	(*)
27 weeks or more............	9.6	9.4	(*)	(*)
Women, 20 years and over				
Total working or looking for work.	24,900	18,400	3,600	2,900
Percent with unemployment.........	24.1	25.5	25.0	13.8
Total with unemployment: Number..	6,000	4,700	900	400
Percent.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1 to 4 weeks................	49.2	46.8	(*)	(*)
5 to 14 weeks...............	29.5	29.8	(*)	(*)
15 to 26 weeks..............	11.5	12.8	(*)	(*)
27 weeks or more............	9.8	10.6	(*)	(*)
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years				
Total working or looking for work.	7,600	4,800	2,000	800
Percent with unemployment.........	55.3	60.4	50.0	50.0
Total with unemployment: Number..	4,200	2,900	1,000	400
Percent.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1 to 4 weeks................	57.1	53.3	(*)	(*)
5 to 14 weeks...............	23.8	23.3	(*)	(*)
15 to 26 weeks..............	11.9	13.3	(*)	(*)
27 weeks or more............	7.1	10.0	(*)	(*)

*Percent distribution is not shown because base is 1,000 or less.

Note: Sums of individual items may not equal totals because of rounding.

Source: Urban Employment Survey, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 29

REASONS NOT LOOKING AND FUTURE JOBSEEKING INTENTIONS OF PERSONS NOT IN THE LABOR FORCE WHO WANT A JOB NOW, BY ETHNIC GROUP, IN THE "ORIGINAL CEP AREA" OF THE HOUSTON LABOR MARKET, JULY 1968-JUNE 1969

(Percent distribution)

Reasons not looking for work	Total	Black	Mexican American	Anglo	Intend to look in next 12 months
Total: Number	9,500	5,500	2,900	1,100	6,100
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Retirement, old age, or school	21.1	23.6	17.2	27.3	23.0
Family responsibilities	23.2	21.8	31.0	18.2	23.0
Health	25.3	29.1	17.2	27.3	21.3
Looked but couldn't find a job	4.2	3.6	6.9	0	4.9
Transportation	5.3	3.6	6.9	9.1	4.9
Too old or young	3.2	1.8	3.4	9.1	3.3
Lack of skill, experience, or education	10.5	9.1	10.3	9.1	11.5
Lack of references, police record	1.1	1.8	0	0	1.6
Other reasons	6.3	5.5	6.9	0	6.6

Note: Sums of individual items may not equal totals because of rounding.

Source: Urban Employment Survey, U.S. Department of Labor.

Table 30
Reasons Not Looking and Future Jobseeking Intentions of Persons Not in the Labor Force Who Want a Job Now, by Ethnic Group and Sex

(Percent distribution)

			WHITE		
REASONS NOT LOOKING FOR WORK	TOTAL	BLACK	Spanish American	Other White	Intend to look in next 12 months
Both Sexes, 16 years and over					
Total reasons:					
Number....................	9,500	5,500	2,900	1,100	6,100
Percent...................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Retirement, old age or school.	21.1	23.6	17.2	27.3	23.0
Family responsibilities.......	23.2	21.8	31.0	18.2	23.0
Health	25.3	29.1	17.2	27.3	21.3
Looked but couldn't find a job	4.2	3.6	6.9	0.0	4.9
Transportation...............	5.3	3.6	6.9	9.1	4.9
Too old or young.............	3.2	1.8	3.4	9.1	3.3
Lack of skill, experience or education.................	10.5	9.1	10.3	9.1	11.5
Lack of references, police record......................	1.1	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.6
Other reasons................	6.3	5.5	6.9	0.0	6.6
Men, 16 years and over					
Total reasons:					
Number....................	2,300	1,300	400	200	1,700
Percent...................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Retirement, old age or school.	39.1	46.2	(3)	(3)	41.2
Family responsibilities.......	0.0	0.0	(3)	(3)	0.0
Health......................	34.8	38.5	(3)	(3)	29.4
Looked but couldn't find a job	4.3	0.0	(3)	(3)	5.9
Transportation...............	4.3	0.0	(3)	(3)	0.0
Too old or young.............	4.3	7.7	(3)	(3)	5.9
Lack of skill, experience or education.................	4.3	7.7	(3)	(3)	5.9
Lack of references, police record......................	0.0	0.0	(3)	(3)	0.0
Other reasons................	8.7	0.0	(3)	(3)	11.8
Women, 16 years and over					
Total reasons:					
Number....................	7,200	4,400	2,200	600	4,600
Percent...................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Retirement, old age or school.	15.3	15.9	13.6	(3)	15.2
Family responsibilities.......	30.6	27.3	40.9	(3)	30.4
Health......................	22.2	25.0	13.6	(3)	17.4
Looked but couldn't find a job	4.2	4.5	4.5	(3)	4.3
Transportation...............	5.6	4.5	4.5	(3)	6.5
Too old or young.............	1.4	2.3	0.0	(3)	2.2
Lack of skill, experience or education.................	12.5	11.4	13.6	(3)	15.2
Lack of references, police record......................	1.4	2.3	0.0	(3)	2.2
Other reasons................	6.9	6.8	9.1	(3)	6.5

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Labor, "Statistical Tables," Poverty in Houston's Central City (February, 1970).

Table 31
Weekly Earnings by Ethnic Group and Sex

(Percent distribution)

WEEKLY EARNINGS	TOTAL			BLACK			WHITE					
							Spanish American			Other White		
	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female
Total Persons with Earnings												
Number...........	46,800	27,700	19,100	30,200	16,400	13,800	9,400	6,700	2,700	7,200	4,700	2,500
Percent..........	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$ 49 and under....	26.9	11.6	47.8	32.0	12.9	53.8	15.7	9.5	28.0	19.4	10.5	33.3
$ 50-64..........	15.2	9.2	23.9	16.5	9.5	24.2	13.5	7.9	28.0	11.3	7.9	16.7
$ 65-74..........	9.1	9.2	9.4	9.0	10.2	7.6	11.2	7.9	16.0	8.1	5.3	5.3
$ 75-99..........	19.7	26.4	10.6	19.1	29.3	8.3	23.6	27.0	16.0	17.7	18.4	20.8
$100-149.........	20.6	30.8	6.1	17.6	29.3	3.8	27.0	34.9	8.0	24.2	28.9	16.7
$150 and over.....	8.4	12.8	2.2	5.8	8.8	2.3	9.0	12.7	4.0	19.4	28.9	4.2
Median weekly earnings..........	$73	$92	$51	$66	$87	$46	$85	$98	$63	$88	$117	$62
Persons on Full-Time Schedules												
Number...........	35,000	22,400	12,700	21,900	13,100	8,800	7,400	5,500	1,900	5,700	3,800	1,900
Percent..........	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$ 49 and under....	14.4	4.0	31.9	18.2	5.2	38.6	5.5	1.9	17.6	10.0	3.2	23.5
$ 50-64..........	16.3	8.0	30.3	18.2	7.8	32.5	13.7	9.4	29.4	12.0	6.5	17.6
$ 65-74..........	10.3	9.5	11.8	11.1	10.4	9.6	11.0	7.5	17.6	10.0	6.5	11.8
$ 75-99..........	23.5	28.6	14.3	23.2	32.2	10.8	26.0	28.3	17.6	18.0	16.1	23.5
$100-149.........	25.1	35.2	8.4	21.7	33.9	6.0	32.9	39.6	11.8	28.0	35.5	17.6
$150 and over......	10.3	14.6	3.4	7.6	10.4	2.4	11.0	13.2	5.9	22.0	32.3	5.9
Median weekly earnings..........	$83	$100	$59	$77	$95	$55	$93	$103	$70	$97	$129	$73

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Labor, "Statistical Tables," Poverty in Houston's Central City (February, 1970).

force is concentrated in the central city, and this rate vacillates between 9.5 on the average to 15.0 percent in some areas with high concentrations of black youths.

The overall labor force participation rate for blacks of 69.6 percent masks a great diversity of experience between the various subgroups. In the age group, 20 years and over, approximately 83.4 percent of black men are in the labor force. This figure is higher than the national figure for this same period. The overall national figure for this age group among young black men approximates about 81 percent. Tables 32, 33, and 34 show employment characteristics for blacks in Houston. Information is presented in Appendix B to provide basic labor force data by age, sex, and ethnic group for Texas and the SMSA's of Dallas and Houston and their central cities.

National Unemployment

The unemployment rate for black and other races and for whites declined considerably during the 1960's, after a sharp rise during the 1961 recession. In 1970, however, unemployment worsened, reaching the 1965 rate for blacks and other minorities, and near the 1964 rate for whites. Unemployment rates for blacks and other minorities were about double those for whites throughout the 1960's and 80 percent higher in 1970 (a ratio of 1.8:1) when the increase in white unemployment was somewhat sharper than that of blacks and other races. Table 35 reflects these trends.

Table 32
Employment Characteristics of Residents of Houston by Race - 1970

Employment Status	Total	Black	Spanish
Male, 16 yrs. and over	639,618	111,087	60,690
Labor force	525,630	82,702	50,937
Percent of total	82.2	74.4	83.9
Civilian labor force	523,526	82,477	50,682
Employed	516,900	79,274	49,475
Unemployed	12,626	3,203	1,207
Percent of civilian labor force	2.4	3.9	2.4
Not in labor force	113,988	28,385	9,753
Inmate of institution	9,747	4,003	1,049
Enrolled in school	40,720	8,098	4,207
Other: Under 65 yrs.	30,415	9,265	2,652
65 yrs and over	33,106	7,019	1,845
Female, 16 yrs. and over	684,402	124,966	60,405
Labor force	298,566	65,373	23,366
Percent of total	43.6	52.3	38.7
Civilian labor force	298,472	65,355	23,359
Employed	286,521	61,224	22,358
Unemployed	11,951	4,131	1,001
Percent of civilian labor force	4.0	6.3	4.3
Not in labor force	385,836	59,593	37,039
Inmate of institution	4,296	485	91
Enrolled in school	45,937	9,964	4,628
Other: Under 65 yrs.	277,796	39,134	29,499
65 yrs. and over	57,807	10,010	2,821
Male, 16 to 21 years old		20,129	12,056
Not enrolled in school		9,199	5,601
Not high school grad.		5,552	4,160
Unemployed or not in labor force		2,494	1,113
Marital Status and Presence of Own Children			
Women, 16 yrs. and over	684,402	124,966	60,405
With own children under 6 yrs.	151,592	30,595	20,936
In labor force	52,036	16,816	6,239
With own children 6 to 17 yrs. only	152,092	24,728	12,781
In labor force	74,039	15,706	5,388
Married women, husband present	438,752	63,469	40,062
In labor force	---	33,596	13,455
With own children under 6 yrs.	134,501	22,072	19,291
In labor force	40,438	11,472	5,227
With own children 6 to 17 yrs. only	131,065	17,299	11,045
In labor force	57,645	10,128	4,323

Table 33

Employment Characteristics of the Population of Houston 1970

	Total	Total %	Total Black	Black Urban	Total Spanish	Urban Spanish
Percent in Labor Force						
Male: 14 and 15 years			12.4	12.9	13.6	14.2
16 and 17 years		35.9	26.3	27.7	37.7	41.7
18 and 19 years		62.6	53.3	51.5	67.9	68.8
20 and 21 years		77.6	73.9	78.8	82.0	84.6
22 to 24 years		87.0	79.8	87.1	89.2	90.8
25 to 34 years		94.5	89.0	93.9	94.4	96.2
35 to 44 years		95.9	91.2	93.4	95.6	96.5
45 to 64 years		90.4	83.5	84.5	91.2	90.6
65 years & older		30.5	27.2	27.8	34.2	34.2
Female: 14 and 15 yrs.		5.1	4.9	5.3	5.7	
16 and 17 years		18.5	13.7	13.6	19.9	21.6
18 and 19 years		46.7	38.2	39.9	41.2	42.3
20 and 21 years		55.8	55.3	56.6	49.8	52.6
22 to 24 years		56.9	62.7	63.8	45.6	48.2
25 to 34 years		47.6	66.5	67.7	42.2	45.4
35 to 44 years		50.3	65.1	65.9	44.0	46.0
45 to 64 years		46.6	54.1	55.1	35.6	36.4
65 years & over		11.8	14.5	15.8	8.2	8.3
Workers in 1969 By Weeks						
Male: 16 yrs & over	561,808		89,248		53,527	
50 to 52 weeks	390,710		52,835		34,764	
27 to 49 weeks	108,785		24,419		12,647	
26 weeks or less	62,313		11,994		6,116	
Female: 16 yrs & over	358,754		74,720		29,129	
50 to 52 weeks	153,978		28,850		11,368	
27 to 49 weeks	104,505		26,429		8,369	
26 weeks or less	100,271		19,441		9,392	

Table 34

Employment Characteristics of the Population of Houston - 1970

Class of Worker, 16 yrs. & over	Total	Total Black	Black Urban	Total Spanish	Urban Spanish
Male employed	510,900	79,274	67,452	49,475	35,098
Private wage or slaary workers	424,294	65,776	55,887	42,539	30,373
Government workers	44,218	9,154	7,982	4,248	2,880
Local government workers	20,507	4,181	3,526	2,166	1,376
Self employed workers	41,491	4,279	3,521	2,585	1,742
Unpaid family workers	897	65	62	103	103
Female employed	286,521	61,224	52,968	22,358	16,993
Government workers	42,248	10,679	9,581	2,515	1,809
Local government workers	25,799	6,035	5,420	1,327	931
Self employed workers	12,740	1,877	1,489	540	455
Unpaid family workers	3,031	177	155	140	96
Male employed in agriculture	8,268	2,091	1,218	986	338
Wage or salary workers	4,599	1,362	678	747	240
Self employed workers	3,529	729	540	239	98
Unpaid family workers	140	----	----	----	----
Female employed in agriculture	1,404	258	193	82	18
Wage or salary workers	874	214	155	71	7
Self employed workers	427	34	28	11	11
Unpaid family workers	103	10	10	----	----
Labor Mobility for Males					
Male 30 to 49 yrs old in 1970	246,732	40,282	33,606	23,519	16,240
Nonworker in 1965, nonworker in 1970	6,347	2,433	1,556	588	309
Nonworker in 1965, worker in 1970	17,887	5,559	5,027	1,617	1,202
Worker in 1965, nonworker in 1970	7,892	2,211	1,505	724	435

TABLE 35

NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATES: 1949 To 1970
(Annual averages)

Year	Black and other races	White	Ratio: Black and other races to white
1949..........	8.9	5.6	1.6
1950..........	9.0	4.9	1.8
1951..........	5.3	3.1	1.7
1952..........	5.4	2.8	1.9
1953..........	4.5	2.7	1.7
1954..........	9.9	5.0	2.0
1955..........	8.7	3.9	2.2
1956..........	8.3	3.6	2.3
1957..........	7.9	3.8	2.1
1958..........	12.6	6.1	2.1
1959..........	10.7	4.8	2.2
1960..........	10.2	4.9	2.1
1961..........	12.4	6.0	2.1
1962..........	10.9	4.9	2.2
1963..........	10.8	5.0	2.2
1964..........	9.6	4.6	2.1
1965..........	8.1	4.1	2.0
1966..........	7.3	3.3	2.2
1967..........	7.4	3.4	2.2
1968..........	6.7	3.2	2.1
1969..........	6.5	3.2	2.0
1970..........	8.2	4.5	1.8

Note: The unemployment rate is the percent unemployed in the civilian labor force.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The national unemployment rates for men and teenagers for blacks and other minorities were higher in central cities than in the suburbs of all metropolitan areas, including Houston, and were lower in twenty cities included in the metropolitan group, than in the central cities of all metropolitan areas. Unemployment of women of black and other races was also lower in the 20 largest metropolitan areas. Table 36 reveals unemployment in central cities and suburbs of all and the 20 largest metropolitan areas for 1970.

Blacks and other minorities constituted one-third or more of the total employed population in eight of the 20 largest cities in the country in 1970. Data for the over 240 metropolitan areas in the United States indicate that black and other races constituted 20 percent of the employed population of all cities in the United States, but only about five percent of those in the suburbs. Comparable proportions were lower for other metropolitan areas as shown in Table 37.

Federal Employment

Black participation, as will be revealed from the data contained in the tables, is conspicuously low in the higher ranks of government service. This is true for Houston, other cities of comparable size, and the Nation as a whole. Brewer completed an impressive study of minority employment in the Federal Government. Released in 1972, the study cites failings in complaint procedures and charges that corrective action, when complaints were upheld, has been weak and unsatisfactory.

Table 36

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CENTRAL CITIES AND SUBURBS OF ALL AND THE 20 LARGEST METROPOLITAN AREAS: 1970

(Metropolitan areas as ranked in 1960. Annual averages.)

Subject	Unemployment rates in metropolitan areas[1]					
	Black and other races		White		Ratio: Black and other races to white	
	20 largest	All areas	20 largest	All areas	20 largest	All areas
Central cities......	7.4	8.3	4.9	4.9	1.5	1.7
Adult men.........	5.5	6.0	4.4	3.9	1.3	1.5
Adult women.......	5.5	6.4	4.2	4.3	1.3	1.5
Teenagers[2]	31.1	31.8	12.9	14.3	2.4	2.2
Suburbs...........	6.4	7.4	4.4	4.5	1.5	1.6
Adult men........	(B)	5.0	(B)	3.0	(B)	1.7
Adult women......	(B)	6.5	(B)	4.6	(B)	1.4
Teenagers........	(B)	26.7	(B)	14.0	(B)	1.9

B Base too small to be shown separately.

[1] Metropolitan areas as defined in 1960.

[2] Teenagers include persons 16 to 19 years old.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 37. PERCENT OF BLACK and OTHER RACES in the TOTAL EMPLOYED POPULATION, by METROPOLITAN AREA: 1970

(Metropolitan areas listed according to rank of proportion Negro in central city 1970, Annual averages)

Metropolitan area	Central City	Outside Central City
Total, all metropolitan areas[1]	20.5	5.2
Washington, D. C.	70.6	6.1
Baltimore, Md.	51.4	7.4
Newark, N. J.	46.7	13.0
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.	41.2	6.2
Cleveland, Ohio	37.4	5.1
Detroit, Mich.	35.6	5.1
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.	34.8	6.6
Philadelphia, Pa.	33.3	6.4
Chicago, Ill.	25.4	2.6
Houston, Texas	24.6	0.5
Pittsburgh, Pa.	22.4	4.7
Paterson, N. J.	19.7	3.8
Cincinnati, Ohio	19.3	0.8
New York, N. Y.	19.3	4.5
Dallas, Tex.	17.4	4.2
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.	16.3	5.3
Boston, Mass.	13.8	1.2
Milwaukee, Wis.	12.6	.0
Buffalo, N. Y.	8.4	2.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	3.4	0.2

---

[1] Metropolitan areas as defined in 1960

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"Delaying tactics of the agencies, too often countenanced by the Equal Employment Commission, have resulted in unreasonable delays in procedures."[4] The report by Brewer, with an introduction by Ralph Nader, indicts the Federal Equal Employment Program (EEOP) of the Civil Service Commission for failing to establish programs and procedures to reduce discrimination in federal government employment. Table 38 gives a breakdown of black employment in all federal agencies for select cities. Federal employment by grade and salary group is shown in Table 39.

The failure picture for Houston compares favorably with other cities of comparable size. Over 36.2 percent of all blacks employed in federal positions in Houston fall within the pay scale of GS-1 through 4; approximately 42 percent of blacks in full-time federal employment in Houston work in postal field service at a pay scale of PFS-1 through 5. A glance at the total wage system shows that 82.7 percent of blacks employed in full-time federal employment have incomes ranging from $5,500 through $6,999. Conversely, of all workers employed in the $14,000 through $17,999 category for full-time federal employment, blacks comprise only 7.7 percent of this group. Table 40 shows the data for full-time federal employment in Houston as of November 30, 1970. When Houston is compared with other cities, it is slightly above many areas. In Dallas, for instance, blacks comprise 15.9 percent of the Civil Service Commission's regions, with less than one percent at grade levels of GS-14 through 15 and about 12 percent at GS-1 through 4. Figures for Saint Louis, Chicago, Seattle, and

TABLE 38

Employment of Blacks by All Federal Agencies in Each of the Commission's Regions as of November 30, 1970

Region	Percentage of Blacks in Population of Region	Percentage of General Schedule Employees who are Black	Percentage of Federal Employees at Each Grade Grouping on the General Schedule who are Blacks:					
			1-4	5-8	9-11	12-13	14-15	16-18
Atlanta	22.9%	6.2%	15.5%	4.8%	3.0%	1.0%	0.8%	1.2%
Boston	3.3%	3.4%	6.5%	3.6%	1.7%	1.4%	1.8%	1.0%
Chicago	9.5%	15.6%	28.5%	18.7%	7.9%	4.3%	2.3%	1.7%
Dallas	15.9%	5.2%	11.8%	4.6%	2.5%	1.1%	0.6%	0.0%
Denver	2.4%	2.5%	4.1%	2.7%	2.0%	0.9%	0.5%	0.0%
New York	11.7%	13.0%	26.7%	16.6%	6.1%	3.5%	2.7%	3.6%
Philadelphia	12.1%	15.0%	28.8%	16.6%	7.3%	3.2%	2.1%	1.0%
Seattle	1.6%	1.9%	3.9%	2.1%	1.0%	0.7%	0.9%	1.5%
San Francisco	7.3%	8.7%	17.4%	11.7%	3.7%	2.0%	1.2%	1.0%
St. Louis	4.3%	8.2%	16.6%	8.3%	4.7%	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%
Central Office Area		21.0%	51.3%	31.2%	12.5%	5.0%	2.4%	1.8%

Table 39

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, by GRADE and SALARY GROUP: 1965 and 1970
(Numbers in thousands)

Pay Category	June 1965		May 1970	
	Total	Percent Negro	Total	Percent Negro
Total, all pay plans[1]	2,291	13	2,593	15
Classification Act[2]	1,126	9	1,292	11
GS - 1 to 4	336	19	308	22
5 to 8	311	10	373	14
9 to 11	265	3	318	5
12 to 18	214	1	293	3
Wage Systems	521	20	544	20
$7,999 ot less	475	21	280	30
$8,000 and over	46	2	264	9
Postal Field Service[3]	586	16	704	19
PFS - 1 to 4	*496	17	93	36
5 to 11	86	8	*603	18
5 to 8	73	9	*579	17
9 to 11	14	2	24	7
12 to 21	4	1	8	4

---

[1] Includes other pay plans, not shown separately.

[2] Classification Act (General Schedule and similar) salary schedules are based on 1970 pay rates which start at $4,326 a year for a GS-1 employee and increase for each grade to $37,624 for GS-18 at the entering level.

[3] Postal Field Service pay rates range from $5,178 a year for a Grade 1 employee to $33,171 for a Grade 21, at the entering level. In 1965 there were 20 PFS grades.

*Includes 4th class postmasters and rural carriers.

SOURCE: U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Table 40

1970 Minority Group Study
Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area
Houston, Texas
Full-Time Employment as of November 30, 1970

Pay System	Total Full-Time Employees	Black		Spanish Surnamed		American Indian		Oriental		All Other Employees	
	Number	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Total All Pay Systems..	16,481	3,811	23.1	983	6.0	26	.2	35	.2	11,626	70.5
Total General Schedule or Similar............	8,869	861	9.7	297	3.3	2	.1	27	.3	7,672	86.5
GS- 1 thru 4	1,521	551	36.2	81	5.3	1	.1	3	.2	885	58.2
GS- 5 thru 8	1,755	147	8.4	92	5.2	4	.2	2	.1	1,510	86.0
GS- 9 thru 11	1,825	111	6.1	55	3.0	2	.1	6	.2	1,651	90.5
GS-12 thru 13	2,663	51	1.9	49	1.8	3	.1	13	.5	2,547	95.6
GS-14 thru 15	1,075	1	.1	20	1.9	2	.2	3	.3	1,049	97.6
GS-16 thru 18	30									30	100.0
Total Wage Systems.....	1,215	485	39.9	58	4.8	5	.4	1	.1	666	54.8
LP thru $5,499	17	6	35.3	1	5.9					10	58.8
$ 5,500 thru $ 6,999	323	267	82.7	7	2.2					49	15.2
$ 7,000 thru $ 7,999	170	115	67.6	7	4.1					48	28.2
$ 8,000 thru $ 8,999	181	56	30.9	11	6.1					114	63.0
$ 9,000 thru $ 9,999	391	31	7.9	30	7.7	5	1.3	1	.3	324	82.9
$10,000 thru $13,999	130	10	7.7	2	1.5					118	90.8
$14,000 thru $17,999	3									3	100.0
$18,000 and Over											

Table 40

Full-Time Employment as of November 30, 1970 (Cont.)

Pay System	Total Full-Time Employees	Black		Spanish Surnamed		American Indian		Oriental		All Other Employees	
	Number	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Total Postal Field Service...............	6,230	2,438	39.1	622	10.0	9	.1	7	.1	3,154	50.6
PFS- 1 thru 5*	5,103	2,113	41.4	530	10.4	8	.2	4	.1	2,448	48.0
PFS- 6 thru 9	969	318	32.8	89	9.2	1	.1	3	.3	558	57.6
PFS-10 thru 12	138	7	5.1	3	2.2					128	92.8
PFS-13 thru 16	20									20	100.0
PFS-17 thru 19											
PFS-20 thru 21											
All Other Pay Systems	167	27	16.2	6	3.6					134	80.2
LP thru $6,499	52	21	40.4	1	1.9					30	57.7
$ 6,500 thru $ 9,999	43	5	11.6	3	7.0					35	81.4
$10,000 thru $13,999	25			1	4.0					24	96.0
$14,000 thru $17,999	9			1	11.1					8	88.9
$18,000 thru $25,999	5	1	20.0							4	80.0
$26,000 and Over	33									33	100.0

*Includes 4th Class postmasters and rural carriers.

Source: U.S. Civil Service Commission, "Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government - SM 70-70 B (November 30, 1970).

Atlanta are similar to those for Houston. For the Central Office Area, 51.3 percent of the GS-1 through 4 category are black employees; 31.2 percent of the GS-5 through 8; 12.5 percent of the GS-9 through 11 and only 5.0 percent of the GS-12 through 13. Less than 5 percent of the employees with grades GS-14 through 18 are black, as shown in Table 40 for the period ending November 30, 1970

Blacks were 15 percent of all Federal Government employees in 1970 compared with 13 percent in 1965. However, they held only 3 percent of the higher grade jobs under the Federal Classification Act, 4 percent of the higher grade Postal Field Service jobs, and less than 10 percent of the Wage Systems (blue-collar type) jobs paying $8,000 and over in 1970.

Occupational Data

General and specific data on occupational status for blacks and other minorities are shown in Tables 41 through 47. The source for the tables (41 through 47) is the publication of the U. S. Census Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, *General Social and Economic Characteristics*, Final Report PC(1)-C-45, Texas.

Table 41

Industry, Last Occupation of the Experienced Unemployed,
And Income in 1967 of the Residents of Houston, 1970

Type of Income of Families	Black	%	Spanish	%
All Families	85,023		44,932	
With wage or salary income	77,225	90.8	41,993	93.5
Mean wage or salary income	$6,669		$8,774	
With nonfarm self-employment income	6,197	7.2	3,861	8.6
Mean nonfarm self-employment income	$3,930		$7,607	
With farm self-employment income	598	0.7	420	0.9
Mean farm self-employment income	$2,367		$ 980	
With Social Security income	13,744	16.1	4,722	10.5
Mean Social Security income	$1,277		$1,284	
With public assistance or public welfare income	7,638	8.9	1,715	3.8
Mean public assistance or public welfare income	$ 872		$ 880	
With other income	9,908	11.7	7,671	17.1
Mean other income	$1,426		$1,931	

Table 42

Industry, Last Occupation of the Experienced Unemployed, And Income in 1969 of Residents of Houston by Race-1970

Industry	Black		Spanish	
	Total	Urban	Total	Urban
Total employed, 16 yrs. and over	140,498	120,420	71,833	52,091
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	2,415	1,434	1,103	370
Mining	1,115	945	1,002	675
Construction	11,269	9,154	8,302	5,367
Manufacturing	22,524	18,852	17,055	12,491
Furniture and lumber and wood products	941	559	1,070	860
Primary metal industries	2,738	2,301	853	617
Fabricated metal industries	2,505	2,152	2,568	1,943
Machinery including electrical	3,769	3,351	3,632	2,730
Transportation equipment	481	433	735	526
Other durable goods	2,943	2,639	1,898	1,438
Food and kindred products	2,454	2,135	1,470	1,082
Textiles and fabricated textile products	461	429	532	473
Printing, publishing and allied industries	671	623	1,047	881
Other nondurable goods	5,561	4,230	3,250	1,941
Trucking service and warehousing	3,480	3,062	1,293	1,052
Other transportation	4,204	3,741	2,220	1,629
Communications, utilities, and sanitary services	4,476	3,843	1,725	1,191
Wholesale trade	7,031	6,505	4,177	3,251
Food, bakery, and dairy stores	2,731	2,379	1,976	1,379
Eating and drinking places	5,868	5,013	2,508	1,849
Other retail trade	12,406	10,831	8,303	6,393
Finance, insurance, and real estate	3,754	3,467	2,775	2,235
Business and repair services	3,988	3,548	3,986	3,115
Private households	12,264	9,508	777	396
Other personal servcies	11,380	10,119	3,190	2,438
Entertainment and recreation services	1,372	1,235	750	471
Hospitals	8,995	8,092	2,062	1,584
Educational and kindred services	9,888	8,580	3,054	1,981
Other professional and related services	6,940	6,109	3,239	2,560
Public administration	4,398	4,003	2,336	1,664

Table 43

Industry, Last Occupation of the Experienced Unemployed and Income in 1969 of Residents of Houston by Race - 1970

	BLACK		SPANISH	
	Total	Urban	Total	Urban
Last Occupation of Experienced Unemployed				
Male, 16 years and over	2,982	2,494	1,133	913
Professional, technical & managerial workers	117	112	51	40
Sales workers	86	81	41	35
Clerical & kindred workers	174	165	31	23
Craftsmen, foremen, & kindred workers	429	366	246	212
Operatives, including transport	672	573	287	243
Laborers, except farm	880	686	262	175
Farm workers	37	26	6	-
Service workers, except private household	549	452	202	178
Female, 16 years and over	3,588	3,122	838	637
Professional, technical & managerial workers	241	229	77	77
Sales workers	208	197	42	26
Clerical & kindred workers	605	553	181	114
Operatives, including transport	414	391	162	124
Other blue-collar workers	162	140	51	36
Farm workers	35	30	7	7
Service workers, except private household	1,198	1,043	253	212
Private household workers	608	448	44	20

Table 44

Industry, Last Occupation of the Experienced Unemployed, and Income in 1969 of the Residents of Houston: 1970

INDUSTRY	BLACK		SPANISH	
	Total	Urban	Total	Urban
Income of families, unrelated individuals, and persons				
All Families	85,023	71,656	44,932	32,229
Less than $1,000	5,371	4,367	1,443	1,110
$ 1,000 to $ 1,999	5,974	4,502	1,420	1,116
$ 2,000 to $ 2,999	6,769	5,455	1,757	1,222
$ 3,000 to $ 3,999	7,504	6,260	2,380	1,763
$ 4,000 to $ 4,999	7,410	6,111	2,932	2,102
$ 5,000 to $ 5,999	7,857	6,579	3,802	2,778
$ 6,000 to $ 6,999	7,627	6,508	3,765	2,681
$ 7,000 to $ 7,999	7,423	6,299	4,160	3,013
$ 8,000 to $ 8,999	6,534	5,689	3,704	2,768
$ 9,000 to $ 9,999	5,457	4,736	3,240	2,250
$10,000 to $11,999	7,131	6,228	5,542	3,723
$12,000 to $14,999	5,385	4,772	5,180	3,719
$15,000 to $24,999	4,003	3,617	4,523	3,171
$25,000 to $49,999	458	431	938	713
$50,000 or More	120	102	146	100
Median Income	$6,213	$6,392	$8,218	$8,119
Mean Income	$6,811	$6,980	$9,361	$9,307
Families with Female Head	18,879	16,234	3,885	3,237
Mean Income	$3,984	$4,117	$5,243	$5,388
All Families & Unrelated Individuals	115,559	98,008	53,055	39,006
Median Income	$4,934	$5,081	$7,466	$7,281
Mean Income	$5,702	$5,831	$8,505	$8,340
All Unrelated Individuals	30,536	26,352	8,123	6,777
Median Income	$1,925	$2,049	$3,077	$3,086
Mean Income	$2,613	$2,707	$3,769	$3,739

Table 45
Occupation and Earnings of Residents of Houston by Race - 1970

OCCUPATION	BLACK		SPANISH	
	Total	Urban	Total	Urban
Female employed, 16 years and over	61,224	52,968	22,358	16,993
Professional, technical & kindred workers	7,074	6,466	2,105	1,624
Nurses	1,053	950	349	265
Health workers, except nurses	863	781	185	144
Teachers, elementary & secondary schools	3,493	3,173	776	570
Technicians, except health	133	133	111	92
Other professional workers	1,532	1,429	684	553
Managers, administrators, except farm	1,116	915	516	460
Sales workers	1,924	1,716	1,701	1,332
Retail trade	1,638	1,463	1,440	1,091
Other than retail trade	286	253	261	241
Clerical and kindred workers	9,453	8,660	7,694	6,237
Bookkeepers	336	294	740	536
Secretaries, stenographers, & typists	1,836	1,694	2,794	2,331
Other clerical workers	7,281	6,672	4,160	3,370
Craftsmen, foremen, & kindred workers	751	653	638	507
Operatives, except transport	4,655	4,183	3,202	2,592
Durable goods manufacturing	1,020	938	1,036	796
Nondurable goods manufacturing	691	624	925	823
Nonmanufacturing industries	2,944	2,621	1,241	973
Transport equipment operatives	514	469	163	112
Laborers, except farm	1,014	911	460	365
Farmers and farm managers	33	27	7	7
Farm laborers and farm foremen	152	127	56	7
Service workers, except private household	21,038	18,060	5,134	3,407
Cleaning service workers	5,015	4,102	1,632	1,029
Food service workers	6,371	5,411	1,556	978
Health service workers	4,489	3,914	660	478
Personal service workers	2,533	2,173	783	570
Protective service workers	60	50	50	42
Private household workers	13,500	10,781	682	343

Table 46

Occupations and Earnings of Residents of Houston by Race - 1970

	BLACK		SPANISH	
	Total	Urban	Total	Urban
Male employed, 14 and 15 years of age	957	799	653	462
White-collar workers	105	99	106	83
Blue-collar workers	502	410	268	174
Farm workers	24	11	24	7
Service workers, including private household	326	279	255	198
Female employed, 14 and 15 years of age	343	264	233	171
Farm workers	16	16	-	-
Service workers, except private household	135	115	96	80
Private household workers	42	17	6	6
Workers in other occupations	150	116	131	85
Median Earnings in 1969 of Persons in Experienced Labor Force for Selected Occupation Groups				
Male, 16 years and over with earnings	$5,190	$5,259	$6,229	$6,193
Professional, managerial, & kindred workers	7,253	7,303	9,599	9,352
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	5,653	5,660	6,753	6,719
Operatives, including transport	5,512	5,566	5,921	5,844
Laborers, except farm	4,580	4,612	4,332	4,295
Farmers and farm managers	2,320	2,568	3,107	...
Farm laborers, except unpaid, & farm foremen	2,202	2,636	3,301	...
Female, 16 years & over with earnings	$2,382	$2,472	$3,732	$3,233
Clerical and kindred workers	3,144	3,174	3,803	3,861
Operatives, including transport	2,713	2,722	3,086	3,141

Table 47

Occupation and Earnings of the Residents of Houston by Race - 1970

OCCUPATION	BLACK	SPANISH
Total employed, 16 years and over	140,498	71,833
Professional, technical and kindred workers	10,868	7,836
Physicians, dentists and related practitioners	201	368
Health workers, except practitioners	2,039	688
Teachers, elementary & secondary schools	4,434	992
Technicians, except health	607	1,071
Other professional workers	3,587	3,717
Managers and administrators, except farm	3,228	3,548
Salaried: Retail trade	774	936
Other industries	1,367	2,040
Self employed: Retail trade	657	294
Other industries	430	275
Sales workers	3,356	4,506
Retail trade	2,338	2,677
Other than retail trade	1,018	1,829
Clerical and kindred workers	15,324	11,132
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	13,616	12,672
Mechanics and repairmen	2,783	2,703
Metal craftsmen, except mechanics	1,186	1,138
Construction craftsmen	4,506	4,486
Other craftsmen	5,141	4,345
Operatives, except transport	17,162	12,696
Durable goods manufacturing	6,278	5,556
Nondurable goods manufacturing	3,565	2,410
Nonmanufacturing industries	7,319	4,730
Transport equipment operatives	12,521	3,082
Truck drivers	6,082	1,554
Other transport equipment operatives	6,439	1,528
Laborers, except farm	17,328	6,321
Construction laborers	3,889	1,988
Freight, stock and material handlers	6,098	2,103
Other laborers, except farm	7,341	2,230
Farmers and farm managers	284	159
Farm laborers and farm foremen	970	531
Service workers, except private household	31,931	9,628
Cleaning service workers	10,462	3,503
Food service workers	8,789	2,955
Health service workers	4,952	817
Personal service workers	3,352	1,236
Protective service workers	578	473
Private household workers	13,910	722

FOOTNOTES

[1] "Cities and Group Conflict," in Kingsley Davis, Cities: Their Origin, Growth, and Human Impact (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1973), pp. 264-65.

[2] "Dimensions of Poverty," in Jeffrey K. Hadden, et al., Metropolis in Crisis (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971), pp. 228-30.

[3] U. S. Department of Labor, Negro Employment in the South: The Houston Labor Market. Manpower Research Monograph No. 23, 1971, pp. 11-16.

[4] M. Weldon Brewer, Jr., Behind the Promises: Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government (1972).

CHAPTER 2

EDUCATION AND DESEGREGATION

"For generations, the schools have had a mission in the United States that went beyond simple learning." Horace Mann, in his description of education, characterized it as "the great equalizer of the conditions of men -- the balanced wheel of the social machinery."[1] This philosophy permeated the whole of the American educational system and fell short only when viewed within the framework of black Americans. For many black Americans, education meant the process of becoming more functionally adjusted to a private world characterized by racism in this country. Black education was unequal and, therefore, could not equalize conditions between blacks and whites in America. Characterized by racism and separatism, education for blacks was governed by a system designed to maintain the status quo. Both black colleges and secondary schools were, by tradition, instrumentalities in the struggle for black people against the demands of a social-cultural environment that denied their survival at the equalitarian level. Gradually, however, black colleges restructured curricula offerings similar to those of white colleges, and the aspirations of blacks stretched beyond their own segregated world. Elementary and secondary schools allegedly operated under the same system for both faces but the amount and quality of education given black children differed. In a recent article published by Time Magazine

(April 16, 1973), it was described this way: "The crisis of doubt about education as an equalizer began in the 1960's after it became obvious that the schools were not performing their historic function for black and Spanish-speaking Americans..." The roots of the problem of segregated education began long before the 1960's. Centuries of neglect in all fields for advancement created vast differentials in opportunities for blacks.

Major developments which led to the U. S. Supreme Court's school desegregation decision began during the early part of the 19th century, but significant legal development can be pinpointed for the period around 1936 in *Pearson vs. Murray*. Donald Murray, a black, enrolled at the University of Maryland Law School. In this case, the Maryland Court of Appeals held that the state must afford equal educational opportunities in its own institutions. Other cases were filed against universities where course offerings were different from those at black institutions. These included such states as Missouri, Oklahoma, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia. Despite these cases involving the various states, where state courts opened white universities to blacks, it was not until the *Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education* decision in 1954 that "separate educational facilities were held inherently unequal." This ruling considered the effects of segregation itself on public education. "In approaching this problem," the Court ruled, "we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the Amendment (Fourteenth) was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy vs. Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation..." It was felt by the Court that only in this way "can it be determined if segregation deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws..."[2] Rejecting any language in Plessy vs. Ferguson, the Supreme Court of the United States concluded in 1954 that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place."

The rendering of the Brown decision made segregated education in America illegal. Initially, the Court was cautious in rendering its verdict. Segregation in education was declared null and void by the Court but implementation guidelines of the decision implied that integrated education should be achieved "with all deliberate speed." The decision was an unprecedented step of legal significance, but as it is with all laws governing human behavior, the Court could not provide the necessary direction for the elimination of attitudes held by the respective groups involved. Nineteen (19) years have passed since the ruling was first handed down and the 1954 mandate has not been effected fully in public education in this country. Resistance, defiance, and rebellion collored the first decade following the initial decree. Defiance, in the form of busing protests and outright rejection by whites, has characterized almost another decade.

In addition, related civil rights legislation in such areas as housing, employment, and public accommodations followed the Brown decision in American society. In each instance, the necessity for social and cultural changes in our society was introduced. Change was not always easy.

Desegregation in Houston

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) did not desegregate its public schools "with all deliberate speed." Instead, for many years school board elections were structured to include the "integration issue." Support for candidates was divided along lines of cleavage such as race and liberal versus conservative. Continuous appeals were launched by school attorneys in efforts to get clarification on rulings and/or to keep the system segregated.[3]

During earlier and critical years, Mrs. Charles E. White, the first black school board member in Houston, ran her first successful campaign with a coalition of liberal blacks and whites. She won the election through a carefully orchestrated drive to point out inequities in the system as related to black and white schools; she demonstrated a concern for the general welfare of students in the total district. Despite black representation on the HISD School Board, little integration or desegregation was achieved until 1967. This is not to imply that the black School Board Member, Mrs. Charles E. White, was not effective. In fact, she was a source of pride to black communities in Houston and throughout the country. It is just that one black on a board with a majority of conservative whites has no real power. As a minority of "one", a black can act in the capacity of a sounding board for the community by protesting decisions contrary to the interests of that community and he can lobby for support from moderate and liberal members on the board. Any other activity is virtually powerless without substantial public support.

The Houston Chronicle (February 12, 1969), in reviewing the legal briefs filed by HISD school attorneys, stated: "The last vestiges of de jure separate schools were not eliminated from HISD until September, 1967, when a 'freedom of choice plan' was inaugurated allowing students to transfer to schools of their choice in the district. On February 11, 1969, the U.S. Department of Justice sought a court order which called for an end to the 'freedom of choice' plan and for a more extensive integration of school facilities. In its brief to the Court, the Justice Department charged that the plan used by Houston failed to 'disestablish the dual school system'." Some Board members and citizens agreed with the Justice Department's brief. They could not get their children to white schools because of the lack of transportation..." Other charges were made concerning school boundaries in the HISD. One school board member stated that the existing boundary system -- used by the HISD at the time -- had been gerrymandered to exclude blacks from all-white schools.

In reviewing the statistics on desegregation for the period in question, there is some validity to the Justice Department's answer. In its petition to the federal government, the Justice Department contended that 81.7 percent of the black students in the HISD in 1969 were enrolled in schools that were 95 percent black; 79.8 percent of the white students in the HISD were enrolled in schools that were 95 percent white. In schools with 95 percent black enrollment, 93 percent of the faculty was black; in schools with 95 percent white enrollment, 94.1 percent of the faculty was white in 1969. In its brief, the

Justice Department asked the Court to order the Houston Independent School District to "formulate and adopt a new student assignment plan and to assign teachers to the various schools on the basis of the overall racial composition of the respective schools. The Houston Post (March 28, 1969) reported that school attorneys sought assistance from U. S. Congressman Bob Eckhardt in the matter. It was reported that Eckhardt refused and charged:

> I believe that the Houston School Board has never really accepted the Supreme Court's decision and what has been done in the location and assignment of children to schools within its jurisdiction has been done in a spirit of frustrating the effect of the decision. It is this, primarily that has made it so difficult to resolve our school problem in Harris County. Only the extremes are presented as possibilities.

Eckhardt made these views known in an open letter and reminded those who had sought his assistance that "it would be grossly improper for me to call the Justice Department and tell them to call of their suit, if that is what you are asking..." All law-abiding citizens, particularly black and brown Americans, applauded Eckhardt for his stand. This admiration transcended the issue of desegregation; it embraced a general respect for a representative who seeks to uphold the law as outlined by the Constitution. On March 26, 1969, the Houston Post took a position similar to that of Eckhardt. In a brief editorial, the paper stated:

> Houston is a desegregated city. It has been for a long time. Black and white citizens get along easily and pleasantly together in desegregated office buildings, buses,

> airplanes, drug stores, restaurants, hotels, colleges and universities, libraries, and public parks. Only the public schools -- the PUBLIC schools -- are burdened with half measures and token integration. Only the Houston School Board has moved with stupid slowness in the inevitable and rewarding growth of Houston as a cosmopolitan city in which all citizens enjoy the same rights and public facilities.[4]

Despite this public outcry by a reputable individual and a responsible and respected institution, HISD attorneys appealed for a stay of the Department of Justice's directives. Following this action, the U.S. District Court in Harris County granted the school district permission to continue with the present plan of "freedom of choice" until September, 1970. At that time, the HISD was instructed to have a new zoning plan ready or a school pairing plan (the so-called "cluster" concept). On June 1, 1970, Federal Judge Ben Connally ruled on a new plan submitted by the School Board. Judge Connally accepted the "equi-distant zoning plan" which required that school zones be drawn exactly equal from adjacent schools. On August 25, 1970, the U. S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans slightly modified the "equi-distant zoning plan" by recommending a "geographic capacity zoning system." Under this plan, the size of school zones is determined by the capacity of schools, with some allowances made for natural hazards posed by the presence of freeways, bayous, freeways, and related natural phenomena.[5] This plan appeared to approximate a realistic approach to the issue of school desegregation, except for the fact that the Mexican-American student population was virtually ignored in the total scheme of things. A series of protests took place because

Chicano students were not treated as a distinct minority. This group feared that the ruling could affect Chicano students in an adverse way. It was felt that the lack of reference to Mexican-American students as a separate minority group could possibly lead to the pairing of Chicano and black students under the disguise of desegregated schools. For integration purposes only, Mexican-American students were being counted as whites.

Statistics on Desegregation

Statistics on five areas vital to the desegregation process in the Houston Independent School District will be examined. These areas include the following: (1) Elementary pupils by race and school; (2) secondary pupils by school and race; (3) teacher assignments by race and school; (4) pupil-teacher ratios by school and race; and (5) withdrawal rates by school. Data on all schools in the district were difficult to achieve. Therefore, the statistics included here will include a select number of schools at the elementary and secondary levels. Three inner city areas represent the Primary Sampling Area.

In Houston, as in most big cities, there appears to be a strange color transition flowing from the inner city to "suburbia". The extent to which the "equidistant plan" will eliminate this flow is difficult to determine at this point. According to the plan, the "equidistant" arrangement was designed to achieve a higher incidence of desegregation in the Houston Independent School District. The equidistant plan, approved by the presiding judge in the Houston case, is a replica of the one approved by the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit of Orange County, Florida in Ellis vs. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida (February 17, 1970). The plan called for separate zoning for elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Each student would be required to attend the school nearest his home. School capacity, distance from the adjacent schools, and other factors affecting the proposed change in boundary lines were believed to be capable of increasing the integration factor.

We chose three inner city elementary schools at random to determine the workability of the "equidistant plan" for Houston. Dodson, Briargrove, and Fondren were selected and data were compiled for the years 1970-72. Table 48 gives a breakdown of pupil composition by race.

Table 48

Percentage Distribution of

Elementary Pupils for Select Schools by Race

	White	Black	Mexican-American
Dodson			
1970	.0%	100.0%	.0%
1971	.7	97.1	2.2
1972	9.1	66.2	24.7
Briargrove			
1970	98.9	.0	1.1
1971	99.4	.0	.8
1972	98.5	.0	1.5
Fondren			
1970	78.9	8.4	12.7
1971	83.0	2.2	14.8
1972	73.6	1.5	24.9

In each of the schools shown in Table 48, the enrollment of white and Mexican-American students increases in the predominantly black Dodson School from 1970-1972. For Briargrove School, the enrollment for Chicano students increased but the enrollment of black students decreased. Fondren School had a black student population of 8.4 percent in 1970 but this figure decreased to less than two percent for 1972. It is difficult to determine the causes for black enrollment decreases in the predominantly white schools. The causes may be racial transfer requests, population mobility, and dismissals and/or suspensions. Data in these areas would have to be analyzed before concrete reasons for the decreases and increases could be determined.

Junior high schools, selected at random, were also analyzed. These schools included Fleming, George Washington, and Albert Thomas junior high schools. Table 49 gives a distribution of pupils for these schools by race. The Fleming Junior High School is predominantly black with a small proportion of Mexican-American students enrolled. The white percentage in Fleming Junior High decreased during the period of 1970-1972. In 1970, there were five whites attending Fleming Junior High School, but by 1972 all whites had either graduated, transferred, or moved out of the area. This same school was 99.6 percent black in 1970. In 1972, however, the percentage of black pupils had decreased 88 percent. The Chicano student population at Fleming increased from less than one percent in 1970 to 12 percent in 1972.

George Washington Junior High School had a more equitable distribution of pupils during the period, 1970-1972. In the case of whites, there was a constant decrease in proportionate representation, from 39.4 percent in 1972. During the same period, black enrollment increased from 15.1 percent in 1970 to approximately 28 percent by 1972. From these data, it appears that the trend of black invasion versus white succession is operative. Table 49 shows the breakdown of school enrollment for select junior high schools in the Houston Independent School District.

Table 49

Percentage Distribution of

Selected Junior High Schools by Race, 1970-1972

	White	Black	Mexican-American
	Student Percentage	Student Percentage	Student Percentage
Fleming			
1970	.0%	99.6%	.4%
1971	.0	88.0	1.4
1972	.0	88.0	12.0
Geo. Washington			
1970	39.4	15.1	45.5
1971	36.3	29.4	34.3
1972	32.9	27.8	39.3
Albert Thomas			
1970	34.4	59.4	8.2
1971	35.0	60.3	4.7
1972	20.9	74.9	4.2

Davis, Jones, and Lee High Schools were used in our analysis. Senior high schools, such as Jack Yates, Kashmere, Booker T. Washington, and Worthing, were not used because of their obvious racial make-up and their general locations -- in predominantly black areas. It was felt that border schools and previously all-white schools were better indicators for the effectiveness of the equidistant plan. As shown in Table 50, white student population representation decreased in the Jefferson Davis Senior High School during the period 1970-1972. In 1970, the proportionate representation at Davis for whites was about 15 percent; in 1971, the figure had decreased to 12.8 percent; and in 1972, the percentage decreased to about 10.3 percent. As is shown in Table 49, black enrollment increased in the schools while Mexican-American enrollment decreased. The same analysis holds true for Jones and Lee schools. The basis for the decrease in enrollment is not clear. Also, it is not clear how much of the decrease is due to transfers, re-assignments, or "white flight".

TEACHER ASSIGNMENTS

Pupil-teacher ratios by school is an important variable in assessing the progress of desegregation in a school system. In a Court decree issued June 1, 1970, it is stated: "Effective no later than August 24, 1970, the principals, teachers, teacher aides, and

Table 50

A Percentage Distribution of Selected Senior High Schools by Race

	White	Black	Mexican-American
	Student Percentage	Student Percentage	Student Percentage
Davis			
1970	14.7%	21.9%	63.4%
1971	12.8	33.8	53.4
1972	10.3	41.5	48.2
Jones			
1970	74.7	18.6	6.7
1971	51.6	40.7	7.7
1972	43.8	48.0	8.2
Lee			
1970	97.1	1.8	1.1
1971	94.1	3.9	2.0
1972	92.9	4.6	2.5

other staff who work directly with children at a school shall be assigned so that the ratio of Negro to white teachers in each school, and the ratio of other staff in each, are substantially the same as each such ratio is to the teachers and other staff, respectively, in the entire school system, with no more than five percent (5%) variance, above and below, in each school."

Three schools were chosen for analysis as related to teacher asssignments in this portion of the study. Alcott (an inner city school), Cooley, and Janowski were compared on the basis of teacher representation by race. The Louisa May Alcott Elementary School is located on Bellfort Street in the South Park residential section of Houston which is a predominantly black area. The Peter Janowski elementary school is located on Bauman; the Cooley School is located on West 17th Street. In the report released by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it is shown that no Mexican-American teachers are in the schools just mentioned. Black representation on the faculty of Alcott School increased each year during the period, 1970-1972; decreased in the Cooley school for the same period; and increased in the Janowski school for the years, 1970-1972. Table 51 shows a distribution of faculty members by race for three elementary schools selected at random for the analysis.

Pupil-teacher ratios for three senior high schools in the Houston Independent School District are shown in Table 52.

Table 51
Teacher Assignments for Three Elementary Schools by Race*

	White	Black	Mexican-Amercian
Alcott			
1970	51	7	0
1971	40	17	0
1972	31	19	0
Cooley			
1970	22	4	0
1971	14	8	0
1972	10	4	0
Janowski			
1970	20	3	0
1971	17	8	0
1972	15	11	0

---

*SOURCE: Report of U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1972-73.

Table 52
Pupil-Teacher Ratios for Select High Schools by Race*

	White	Black	Mexican-American
Lincoln			
1970	53(T)/108(P)	3(T)/636(P)	0(T)/149(P)
1971	24(T)/87(P)	13(T)/481(P)	0(T)/127(P)
1972	21(T)/70(P)	15(T)/512(P)	0(T)/126(P)
Waltrip			
1970	98(T)/2,398(P)	5(T)/105(P)	4(T)/17(P)
1971	79(T)/2,199(P)	24(T)/134(P)	1(T)/129(P)
1972	70(T)/2,128(P)	24(T)/169(P)	1(T)/127(P)
Westbury			
1970	91(T)/1,994(P)	6(T)/2(P)	1(T)/19(P)
1971	66(T)/1,890(P)	21(T)/15(P)	1(T)/17(P)
1972	54(T)/1,931(P)	23(T)/22(P)	1(T)/20(P)

---

* T = Teachers; P = Pupils.

Lincoln High School's teacher-pupil ratio increased. The black teacher-pupil ratio decreased from 1:212 to 1:34, and the Mexican-American teacher-pupil ratio remained constant for the period, 1970-1972, with no teachers represented. At Waltrip High School the white teacher-pupil ratio increased; the black teacher-pupil ratio decreased. The same pattern occurred in the Westbury Senior High School. The report on the progress of desegregation for the HISD, released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on October 2, 1972, gave a breakdown of the school population by race. Teacher-pupil ratios and percentages are shown in Table 53.

Table 53

Race of Students and Staff as Reported on H.E.W. Reports
(as of October 2, 1972)

	White	Black	Mexican-American
STUDENTS			
Senior high	53.1%	35.2%	11.2%
Junior high	45.4	39.0	15.1
Elementary	39.8	40.9	18.9
Total	43.6	39.4	16.5
STAFF			
Senior high	65.7	31.8	2.0
Junior high	63.9	33.2	2.6
Elementary	58.2	39.1	2.5
Total	61.2	36.0	2.5

As shown in Table 53, white teachers comprise 61.2 percent of the teaching staff in Houston, with only 43.6 percent of the population listed as white. Thirty-six percent (36%) of the teaching staff in elementary, junior, and senior high schools in the HISD were black persons in 1972, with 39.4 percent of the student body listed as black. On the other hand, Mexican-American representation in the student bodies was 11.2 percent at the senior high level; 15.1 percent at the junior high level; and 18.9 percent at the elementary level for the HISD. Mexican-Americans comprised about 17 percent of the student body in all schools in the District as of October, 1972. Staff representation for Mexican-Americans was about 2.0 percent at the senior high level, but less than three percent (3%) at the junior high or elementary level. This small proportionate representation by Mexican-American teachers in the school system is critical considering the large student population in the District. It is a critical problem but not an unusual one. Many large urban areas with substantial Chicano student populations are experiencing difficulty in recruiting Mexican-American teachers because of an apparent shortage in the State.

WITHDRAWALS

There were substantial withdrawals from both black and white schools in the District. A selected number are shown in Table 54. Withdrawals at predominantly black Wheatley High School increased during the period, 1970 through 1972; students withdrawing from Jack Yates Senior High School decreased by 38 percent. Withdrawals at Terrell and Key schools increased by five and seventeen percent, respectively. Likewise, Benbrook withdrawals increased only slightly with those at Durkee increasing by 46 which is 22 percent.

Table 54

Withdrawals from Selected Schools in the Houston Independent School District, 1970 - 1972

	1970	1971	1972
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS			
Wheatley	289	171	389
Yates	510	371	315
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS			
Key	196	272	237
Terrell	151	142	160
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			
Benbrook	76	87	84
Durkee	156	152	202

Referrals for disciplinary reasons were greatest among the black student population, with an almost equal number for white and Mexican-American students. During the 1971-72 school year, 25,272 or 39.9 percent of all such referrals were black; 18,739 or 29.5 percent, white; and 19,221 or 30.3 percent were Mexican-American.

Black students, as well as their parents, charge that many teachers fail to understand their needs and aspirations. In talking with several students who had been suspended or had voluntarily withdrawn from school, we found that most complaints are against teachers and administrative officials. The most common of these relate to what they call "negative attitudes shown by white teachers in previously all-black situations." We could not verify the charges made because an objective study would have to be conducted to determine the accuracy of such charges. However, the existence of such perceptions would, we think, suggest the need for better understanding between pupils, teachers, and administrators in interracial school situations.

BUSING VERSUS DESEGREGATION: SOME RESEARCH FINDINGS

The September issue of a publication of the Center for National Policy Research (September, 1972, pp. 1-3) reviews several studies concerning the benefits (or lack of benefits) of integrated education to black and white school children.[6] In effect, the studies cited in the report on Civil Rights research were designed to assess the effects of busing and integration on the academic achievements of the pupils involved in the processes.

"For many, busing for the purpose of achieving racial integration has become a code word, replacing the phrase of "law and order," for a set of beliefs about the integration of blacks and whites in American society."[7] Proponents of busing, as one of the tools to achieving desegregated schools, justify their positions on the basis of the equalitarian concept inherent in democracy; others, less convinced and more negative toward the idea of busing, view it as an unnecessary means to an end. Anti-busing stands are often regarded as evidence of racism, while those with a pro-busing stance see their positions as reflecting a positive commitment to integration and to an end to the dual system of education brought on by segregated housing patterns and deliberate defiance by public school administrations.

These two opposing stands are reflected in recent researches which claim to show negative effects of busing and rebuttals by the pro-busing advocates.

Armor's study, "The Effects of Busing," sought to assess the effects of induced integration rather than "natural" integration that would arise out of voluntary neighborhood integration. Introducing what he called an "Integration Policy Model," Armor states:

> Inequality and segregation are mutually reinforcing conditions, reflecting not only the judicial doctrine that separation is inherently unequal, but also the social reality that segregation of a deprived group can cut off channels and networks that might be used to gain equality. Segregation and inequality combine to cause psychological damage in children resulting in low achievement as an adult and further reinforces white prejudices (the vicious circle).[8]

Data for the Armor study were obtained from investigation of voluntary integration programs in Boston, Hartford, New Haven, White Plains, Ann Arbor, and Riverside where racial transfers had taken place. Based on the findings from his study, the author made several startling conclusions concerning busing.

One such finding indicated that measures such as self-esteem and academic achievement did not increase in an appreciable way. Another finding which he considered to be part of his "Integration Policy Model" was that the dropout rate from college is higher for the bused students, however, these same students are much more likely to enter college than their control counterparts. Armor also found, from his analysis of the data, that aspirations for educational and occupational achievement declined for bused students. Conclusions from these data involved two major findings: (1) There may be justifications for school integration other than those in the integration policy model (summarily cited above), but then the burden must fall upon those who support a given school integration program to demonstrate that it has intended effects (with no unintended negative side effects); and (2) Massive mandary busing for purposes of improving student achievement and interracial harmony is not effective and should not be adopted at this time. There is some question as to the validity of the research design utilized in the investigation by Armor.

Many leaders around Boston -- black and white -- condemned the Armor study as "an act of pure racism." many of those who condemned the study were distinguished researchers at Harvard where Armor is employed, including such notables as Thomas Pettigrew, Marshall Smith, Clarence Normand, and Elizabeth Useem of Boston State College. The Winter Edition of Public Interest (1972) carries a rebuttal of "A Critique of 'The Evidence of Busing'" and the aforementioned authors criticized Armor's research design and charged that the data were distorted to fit the study's anti-busing bias.[9] The basic deficiency found in the study's methodology was the failure to investigate conditions within the schools involved in the desegregation programs to determine whether a quality interracial experience was provided or if certain numbers of black and white students simply attended classes in the same building; nor was there any effort made to determine the competency of the teachers assigned to classes where blacks were enrolled and the attitudes of white teachers generally toward the in-coming students.

Interviews with students in the Houston Independent School District indicate that some pupils experience difficulty in communicating with the white teachers and that these same teachers tend to ignore them in classes. Other students cited insecurity, the lack of a feeling of belongingness, and hostile classmates as experiences they have encountered while being bused to previously all-white schools. There were some students attending predominantly white schools in Houston who appeared to be getting along very well with their teachers and with their classmates. The schools where this atmosphere prevails frequently are those schools where racial percentage representation is more equal or the schools are located in areas of transition -- usually from white to black areas.

Contrary to Armor's findings, two recent studies of black pride indicate that black Americans genreally have as high opinion of themselves as white have of themselves, but their self-esteem rests more on their personal relationships that their careers. The research, conducted by University of Connecticut sociologists and published in Human Behavior (1973), shows that lower class blacks rate themselves higher than lower-class whites in their roles as parents, children, spouses, and conversationalists. Among the middle class, blacks and whites gave themselves almost equal ratings. Black self-esteem dipped more sharply in rating qualities concerning career success in school and on the job. Black women rate themselves higher in intellectual ability than white women. Another interesting finding challenged the assumption that blacks judge themselves by white standards. Sociologists

John D. McCarthy and William L. Yancey found that blacks measure their worth against the standards of their own "subculture." In situations where white teachers were working in predominantly black school situations for the first time, the knowledge of findings relating to self-esteem and black awareness could serve useful purposes.

Cohen, Pettigrew and Riley in On Equality of Educational Opportunity[10] discuss "Race and the Outcomes of Schooling" and challenge the Armor findings by stating that "quality integration, with integrated classrooms as well as schools, integrated staffs, and proper remedial services, often leads to significant achievement gains by both black and white students." It should be pointed out that much of the controversy concerning the effects of busing centers on the differential meanings of the concepts of desegregation and integration. Where quality integration takes place, achievement gains have been made for both races; where desegregation has taken place (labeled by Armor as "induced" integration), little achievement, if any, can be cited. It is important that one realize that sesegregation in classrooms has more often taken place under adverse conditions. Teachers, as well as students, have displayed extreme negative attitudes toward students of different races. In some large urban school districts, suspensions and/or expulsions, withdrawals, and general disturbances have increased. These negative attitudes reflect the general climate of the community where desegregation takes place and the reactions of the school administration and the society at large. Anti-busing advocates in Dallas demonstrated for days against the "forced busing of school children." Other areas such as Detroit, Pontiac, and even Houston have joined protests calling for the passage of a constitutional amendment against busing. Some of these same anti-busing advocates are among those participating in the so-called "white flight" to the suburbs. It is no wonder that Armor and others with similar ideological strains, would seek an answer through faulty conclusions and distorted facts.

William J. Taylor in Dissent discusses the realities and evasions of busing and responds to the Nixonian attack on court-ordered integration in the Fall issue of the publication.[11] Taylor reviews the Constitutional bases for requiring integration in the country, cites evidence that integration has worked in some parts of the country, and challenges certain myths about busing. In the following paragraphs, we will explore what we consider to be myths about busing in the light of available evidence in Houston.

Busing Myths

MYTH #1 - Myth Number One figures heavily in the Nixonian philosophy about busing. In a televised speech during the Spring of 1972, President Nixon stated that there was "massive busing" in this country. Across the nation only about forty percent of all school children are actually bused to and from school, which is indeed a massive amount of busing; but only about three percent are bused to achieve integrated schools. Even where busing does occur, the burden of busing is borne by black and Chicano students. Statistics concerning the results for effects of busing were compiled for the period ending Dec., 1971 for students in Houston. Table 55 gives a breakdown of the results for effects of busing in Houston for "Paired Schools" and "Majority-Minority Transfers" by race. As will be indicated, the bulk of the students being bused in Houston comes from minority group areas. The percentage of black students involved in busing ranges from a low of 63.3 percent for paired schools to a high of 97.4 percent for the same period for majority-minority transfers. The situation relating to blacks and Chicanos remained practically the same until January of 1973.

Table 55

Busing Statistics for Houston*

	White	Black	Mexican-American
DECEMBER, 1971			
Paired Schools	6.0%	63.3%	30.7%
Majority-Minority Transfers	2.0	97.4	0.5
JUNE, 1972			
Paired Schools	10.0	71.6	18.3
Majority-Minority Transfers	7.4	90.5	1.9
JANUARY, 1973			
Paired Schools	5.6	69.4	24.9
Majority-Minority Transfers	3.1	95.5	1.2

---

*See footnotes at end of chapter.

MYTH #2 - The second myth relates to the charges that busing is required to achieve something called "racial balance." The fact is that there is not a single pupil in this country being bused for that purpose. After reviewing developments since the issuance of the initial decree to end "separate but equal" schools, one can conclude that the advent of busing came when districts failed to comply with court ordered desegregation and open housing laws. Busing under court order is for one reason and one reason only -- to desegregate "segregated" school systems. Judge Wisdom of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals (Dallas Times Herald, April 18, 1972) discussed busing in a speech at Tulane University last year. He stated that "justice must be color-conscious as well as color blind when it becomes necessary to remedy the evils of past discrimination based on color."

Anti-busing advocates would lead the public to believe that federal courts, without mercy, have escalated their demands on school districts throughout the North and South. To believe that this is the case is to ignore the fact that school districts would not have been taken to court in the first plake if they had not been guilty of constitutional violations.

Nineteen years have passed since the rendering of the now famous Brown Decision, but there are still districts which have not complied with the order of the Court. Delays, non-compliance tactics such as appeals and counter-suits, and direct defiance have been measures used by those who are opposed to desegregating school systems. It may very well be that objections to busing are thin disguises to avoid or to minimize desegregating public schools. Vast sums of money have been used on litigation in the courts for purposes of feeding inclinations toward non-compliance through continuous appeals and the filing of briefs with the court. Tax funds are actually being used indiscriminately to slow any progress toward complete desegregation.

MYTH #3 - An often cited myth is that white children are being bused for unreasonably long distances. The fact is that black children have borne the disproportionate amount of the burden of busing to achieve desegregation. In the Houston Independent School District, over 90 percent of the children bused are black or Chicano; they spend more time on buses and travel longer distances. Minority group children are still the victims of whatever standards are imposed -- not white children. White students in Houston, as in other cities, have reaped the greatest benefits by virtue of their birth and color, if education is as Mann said, "an equalizer of the conditions of men." It has provided mechanisms through which this can be achieved for the majority race, not the black or Mexican-American citizens. And, if one wants to question whether busing is feasible in the light of the inequities in school facilities (inner city schools versus other schools), he must remember that there is less busing now than when it was done to preserve the unconstitutional segregated school.

MYTH #4 - Another myth about busing is that it is not a racial issue; rather, that people are just concerned about preserving the neighborhood school concept. Innovations in transportation have made the population in urban areas an extremely mobile one. Few people consider neighborhood schools when they send their children to private schools such as prestigious academies or to colleges and universities.

The whole "social experiment" story is a myth, too. Children are not bused for a social experiment; they are bused because the Constitution forbids unequal, segregated schools. They are bused because it is a black or brown child's constitutional right (as it is with white children) not to be herded into a separate, inferior school.

PROGRESS TOWARD DESEGREGATION

We have tended to dwell on the comparative aspects of desegregation along rather negative lines. Some schools in Houston are desegregated. These schools are located in or near integrated neighborhoods. Some people are of the opinion that the "equi-distant plan" contributed to desegregation efforts also. Table 56 shows the percentage breakdown of some of the schools cited as most successful in their desegregation efforts. Table 57 shows the least successful schools at achieving desegregation in the HISD.

Table 56

A Percentage Distribution of Pupils in Selected Schools in HISD (Most Desegregated)

	White	Black	Mexican-American
Piney Point	45.8%	43.2%	11.0%
Burbank	55.2	26.4	18.4
Furr	42.6	47.3	10.1
Lanier	62.6	31.2	6.2
Jones	43.8	48.0	8.2
Sterling	51.0	44.1	4.9

---

*There may be some discrepancies in figures because they were collected from numerous reports and newspaper accounts.

Table 57

A Percentage Distribution of Pupils for Select Schools in HISD (Least Desegregated)*

	White	Black	Mexican-American
Blackshear	0 %	100.0%	0 %
Carnegie	0	100.0	0
DeZavala	1.6	.5	97.9
Douglass	0	100.0	0
Franklin	8.6	1.1	90.3
Herod	98.5	0	1.5
Lovett	98.8	.2	1.0
Walnut Bend	98.9	.1	1.0
White	98.1	.1	1.8
Fondren	97.0	1.2	1.8

---

*Any discrepancies in percentage are related to differences in source of data.

The purpose of the commentary on school desegregation was not to indict the school system, but one cannot escape the fact that the dual system in American society -- or in Houston, for that matter -- has not been completely dismantled. A report by a bi-racial committee acknowledged this on August 29, 1972 as follows: "The current implementation of the desegregation program is not working in behalf of the upward mobility of minority students as much as all would desire..." The committee urged that the Court re-examine its entire desegregation order of August 25, 1970, with the view toward directing action which achieves upward mobility of minority students. Some accomplishments have been made since this statement was issued, but as will be shown in the statistics on higher education and in the chapter on "Civil Rights", minority groups still have quite a distance to go before becoming complacent in the feeling that "we have done all we can."

The City of Houston can meet the challenges of our time through a continuous and realistic approach to the problems with which it is faced. It is reasonable to expect that growths of misunderstanding and myths, prejudice and confusion cannot be erased over night. But, almost two decades have passed since school districts were ordered to dismantle the segregated system, and time is working against those who are victims of inequality.

The chronology of major desegregation developments in the nation and Houston has been included as a means of introducing data on the status of school desegregation in Houston. Selected data have also been included on higher education for blacks and state employment.

STATISTICS ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND STATE EMPLOYMENT BY RACE

General tables are given in this section on black college enrollment by sex, black college enrollment by type of institution, percentage of persons 25 years of age and over who completed four years of high school or more, and four years of college or more for selected metropolitan areas, average budgeted faculty salaries and ranges by rank and institution for public senior colleges and universities in Texas for public junior colleges.

Selected data are presented as related to State employment by race and average pay. Data in this section were obtained from a Report of the Texas Association of College Teachers, the United States Census

Bureau, and local dailies: The Houston Chronicle (April 10, 1973); and The Houston Post (November 26, 1972).

TABLE 58

Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data
From Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1970 (with
1972-73) (NA-Not available)

	TOTAL	BLACK	MEXICAN-AMERICAN
1. DOMINICAN COLLEGE			
1970	272	29	39
Percentage		10.7	14.3
1972-1973*	350	59	27
Percentage		16.8	7.7
2. HOUSTON BAPTIST COLLEGE			
1970	891	64	28
Percentage		7.2	3.1
1972-1973	1,121	NA	NA
Percentage			
3. RICE UNIVERSITY			
1970	2,332	48	25
Percentage		2.1	1.1
1972-1973	3,246	78	NA
Percentage		2.4	
4. ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY			
1970	1,082	46	93
Percentage		4.3	8.6
1972-1973	1,650	NA	NA
Percentage			
5. UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON			
1970	13,546	45	759
Percentage		.3	5.6
1972-1973	NA	NA	NA
Percentage			
6. TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY			
1970	3,610	3,568	14
Percentage		98.8	.4
1972-1973	6,396	5,952	NA
Percentage		93.1	
7. SOUTHWEST TEXAS JUNIOR COLLEGE			
1970	915	5	386
Percentage		.5	42.2
1972-1973	NA	NA	NA
Percentage			
8. SOUTH TEXAS JUNIOR COLLEGE			
1970	1,930	6	152
Percentage		.3	7.9
1972-1973	2,876	NA	NA
Percentage			

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, Office for Civil Rights.
* 1972-1973 figures obtained by telephone

Table 59

College Enrollment of Persons 18 to 24 Years Old, by Sex: 1965 and 1970

(Numbers in thousands)

Sex and race	1965 Total 18 to 24 years old	1965 Enrolled in college Number	1965 Enrolled in college Percent of total	1970 Total 18 to 24 years old	1970 Enrolled in college Number	1970 Enrolled in college Percent of total
Black...........	2,041	210	10	2,692	416	16
Male.........	935	99	11	1,220	192	16
Female.......	1,106	111	10	1,471	225	15
White...........	16,505	4,213	26	19,608	5,305	27
Male.........	7,641	2,593	34	9,053	3,096	34
Female.......	8,864	1,620	18	10,555	2,209	21

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Table 60
Black Students Enrolled in College by Type of Institution: 1964 to 1968, and 1970

(Numbers in thousands)

Subject	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1970
Total, Black college enrollment	234	274	282	370	434	522
Enrollment in predominantly Black colleges[1]	120	125	134	144	156	144
Percent of total	51.3	45.6	47.5	38.9	35.9	27.6
Enrollment in other colleges (not predominantly Black)[1]	114	149	148	226	278	378
Percent of total	48.7	54.4	52.5	61.1	64.1	72.4

[1] Data on colleges are for 4 and 2 year institutions and professional schools, both private and public (including community colleges). Statistics for 1966 to 1970 include enrollment figures for nondegree-credit students. Prior to 1966 only degree-credit students are included.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Table 61
Percent of Persons 25 Years Old and Over, Who Completed Four Years of High School or More and Four Years of College or More, for Selected Metropolitan Areas: 1969

Standard metropolitan statistical area	4 years of high school or more	4 years of college or more
14 selected SMSA's:		
White..................	61	14
Black and other races.	43	7
Atlanta, Ga.:		
White..................	64	17
Black and other races.	31	7
Baltimore, Md.:		
White..................	51	10
Black and other races.	26	5
Chicago, Ill.:		
White..................	61	13
Black and other races.	43	8
Cleveland, Ohio:		
White..................	62	14
Black and other races.	35	5
Detroit, Mich.:		
White..................	56	10
Black and other races.	40	5
Houston, Tex.:		
White..................	59	13
Black and other races.	40	7
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.:		
White..................	69	15
Black and other races.	58	11
New Orleans, La.:		
White.................	56	12
Black and other races	35	6
New York, N.Y.:		
White.................	58	14
Black and other races	45	6
Newark, N.J.:		
White.................	57	12
Black and other races	46	4
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.:		
White.................	57	13
Black and other races	37	5
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.:		
White.................	51	11
Black and other races	32	2
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.:		
White.................	74	19
Black and other races	57	13
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.:		
White.................	81	30
Black and other races.	47	11

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 62

AVERAGE BUDGETED FACULTY SALARIES AND RANGES, BY RANK AND INSTITUTION
FOR
PUBLIC SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN TEXAS
Nine Months: 1972-73

Institution	Professors				Associate Professors				Assistant Professors			
	No. FTE Faculty	Average Salaries	Highest Salaries	Lowest Salaries	No. FTE Faculty	Average Salaries	Highest Salaries	Lowest Salaries	No. FTE Faculty	Average Salaries	Highest Salaries	Lowest Salaries
The University of Texas at Arlington ..	108.74	$ 16,797	$ 24,375	$ 12,100	140.13	$ 13,502	$ 17,400	$ 9,700	159.55	$ 11,163	$ 14,800	$ 8,000
The University of Texas at Austin	554.92	21,169	36,000	13,000	403.80	14,938	19,500	11,000	454.47	12,562	20,500	10,000
The University of Texas at Dallas	16.36	23,250	31,800	18,300	12.91	15,235	17,400	12,900	13.31	12,005	14,400	9,000
The University of Texas at El Paso	105.65	16,926	23,000	12,000	89.13	13,935	17,800	10,200	141.61	11,303	15,400	8,000
Texas A & M University	239.62	19,216	30,150	12,490	241.67	14,963	20,790	8,208	260.79	12,439	20,290	8,100
Prairie View A. and M. College	26.70	16,342	19,512	13,500	38.81	13,585	15,940	10,260	91.25	11,415	14,040	8,100
Tarleton State College	25.65	14,632	17,298	12,177	22.33	12,184	14,760	10,674	52.55	10,325	13,545	8,703
Texas A & I University	57.20	17,451	19,800	14,895	71.33	14,415	18,450	13,050	90.75	11,951	14,355	10,530
Laredo Center	3.00	16,410	16,920	15,840	4.00	14,895	15,300	14,580	14.00	11,970	12,915	11,025
East Texas State University	103.53	16,681	18,325	13,800	65.00	13,706	15,450	11,000	107.00	11,920	14,350	9,725
Texarkana Center					2.00	15,250	16,000	14,500	9.00	11,678	13,000	11,200
University of Houston	236.76	19,734	30,000	12,510	258.59	15,128	21,105	9,675	214.00	12,559	15,705	9,000
Lamar University	87.00	17,505	19,914	14,920	75.75	13,588	17,255	10,688	101.08	11,235	13,800	8,820
Orange Center									1.50	9,551	10,704	8,975
Midwestern University	27.90	15,808	18,830	12,010	28.00	12,551	15,510	10,840	50.00	11,003	15,516	9,000
North Texas State University	194.21	18,532	22,736	14,810	140.42	14,762	18,000	10,300	187.14	11,982	14,925	9,590
Pan American University	38.60	15,947	17,460	15,120	63.10	13,636	14,940	12,600	59.30	11,628	12,420	10,260
Stephen F. Austin State University	73.83	16,627	18,000	14,000	86.00	13,477	16,000	11,700	135.54	11,359	13,500	9,600
Texas Southern University	34.75	16,188	18,554	15,000	31.84	13,948	16,364	12,883	98.08	11,597	14,560	10,000
Texas Tech University	225.53	18,206	35,000	11,000	244.08	13,999	20,000	9,500	249.87	11,772	18,500	7,700
Texas Woman's University	42.96	18,737	22,000	14,025	64.18	15,859	18,550	13,005	107.48	13,118	15,619	9,650
West Texas State University	40.80	16,658	19,008	15,003	64.50	13,954	17,658	11,754	103.25	11,723	14,319	9,180
Angelo State University	29.25	17,013	17,244	14,328	29.55	14,014	15,372	11,628	54.00	11,431	12,960	8,784
Sam Houston State University	97.50	16,572	17,249	13,077	98.00	14,088	15,336	11,683	110.33	12,267	13,581	10,881
Southwest Texas State University	73.31	16,207	18,375	13,743	73.10	13,739	17,625	11,781	123.89	11,571	13,554	9,801
Sul Ross State University	23.50	14,288	15,462	12,006	11.00	11,400	12,627	10,305	29.50	9,856	13,302	8,600
Total	2467.27				2359.22				3019.24			
Weighted Average		$ 18,564				$ 14,359				$ 11,912		

TABLE 62

AVERAGE BUDGETED FACULTY SALARIES AND RANGES, BY RANK AND INSTITUTION FOR PUBLIC SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN TEXAS

Nine Months: 1972-73
(continued)

Institution	Instructors				Lecturers		Teaching Assistants		All Ranks	
	No. FTE Faculty	Average Salaries	Highest Salaries	Lowest Salaries	No. FTE Faculty	Average Salaries	No. FTE Faculty	Average Salaries	No. FTE Faculty	Average Salaries
The University of Texas at Arlington	57.37	$ 8,760	$ 12,700	$ 7,000		$	56.50	$ 5,464	522.29	$ 12,083
The University of Texas at Austin	126.10	9,542	13,000	8,000	15.24	13,889	408.30	6,500	1962.83	14,039
The University of Texas at Dallas					.83	13,863			43.41	17,239
The University of Texas at El Paso	69.77	8,946	11,520	6,867			57.84	5,000	464.00	11,949
Texas A & M University	70.35	8,578	11,880	6,732	23.43	9,583	154.86	6,300	990.72	13,393
Prairie View A. and M. College	55.26	9,719	14,400	8,100			3.00	7,400	215.02	11,926
Tarleton State College	27.12	8,557	10,278	6,750			7.25	6,134	134.90	10,871
Texas A & I University	82.32	9,653	11,115	8,100			45.59	5,744	347.19	12,003
Laredo Center	3.00	10,305	10,350	10,215			1.50	5,400	25.50	12,368
East Texas State University	81.60	9,413	12,200	8,416			81.53	7,875	438.66	12,090
Texarkana Center	1.00	10,000	10,000	10,000			3.00	5,000	15.00	10,707
University of Houston	87.70	9,312	14,400	4,950	94.94	5,228	223.29	5,883	1115.28	12,462
Lamar University	106.00	8,751	13,525	7,500	.13	10,000	13.75	5,702	383.71	12,236
Orange Center	9.00	7,159	8,830	6,000					10.50	7,501
Midwestern University	35.25	9,277	11,130	7,500			21.25	5,400	162.40	10,988
North Texas State University	75.09	9,496	11,890	6,220			179.15	8,252	776.01	13,022
Pan American University	60.60	8,694	9,900	7,740			4.10	11,471	225.70	12,138
Stephen F. Austin State University	73.45	8,953	10,500	7,000			46.67	7,500	415.49	11,875
Texas Southern University	83.50	9,015	11,500	8,500	3.35	7,199			251.52	11,613
Texas Tech University	62.32	8,205	12,600	6,500	7.34	11,213	219.33	5,624	1008.47	12,188
Texas Woman's University	76.67	10,806	13,500	6,908			30.42	8,252	321.71	13,404
West Texas State University	60.50	9,074	11,500	7,500			46.00	5,851	315.05	11,453
Angelo State University	27.00	9,234	9,792	7,344	4.40	8,329			144.20	12,587
Sam Houston State University	57.40	9,666	10,269	9,459					363.23	13,503
Southwest Texas State University	104.89	9,077	11,250	8,046			61.26	6,012	436.45	11,333
Sul Ross State University	30.75	8,729	11,340	7,800			39.81	5,400	134.56	9,181
Total	1524.01				149.66		1704.40		11,223.80	
Weighted Average		$ 9,190				$ 7,272		$ 6,419		$ 12,623

SOURCE: The TACT Bulletin, Vol. XXV, No.2, (January-March, 1973), pp. 6-8.

Table 63
AVERAGE BUDGETED FACULTY SALARIES
FOR
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES IN TEXAS
Nine Months: 1972-73

	Highest Salaries	Lowest Salaries	Average Salaries
Alvin Junior College	$ 15,336	$ 9,000	$ 10,972
Amarillo College	14,702	9,000	10,957
Angelina College	10,800	8,172	9,272
Bee County College	11,700	8,200	9,384
Blinn College	11,925	7,500	9,738
Brazosport College	13,006	8,100	10,472
Central Texas College	13,950	9,300	11,690
Cisco Junior College	11,450	5,291	8,459
Clarendon Junior College	10,400	8,500	9,163
College of the Mainland	13,455	8,910	10,292
Cooke County Junior College	11,600	8,000	8,924
Dallas County Community College District	16,785	8,506	10,042
Del Mar College	18,980	8,300	11,583
El Paso Community College	10,300	7,800	8,408
Frank Phillips College	10,690	8,550	8,791
Galveston College	15,078	8,505	10,979
Grayson County Junior College	10,600	8,240	10,248
Henderson County Junior College	12,175	7,200	8,941
Hill Junior College	10,200	7,050	8,348
Houston Community College	*	*	6,000
Howard County Junior College	13,900	5,250	8,723
Kilgore College	16,800	8,000	10,325
Laredo Junior College	13,910	6,900	10,644
Lee College	16,150	8,350	11,865
McLennan Community College	13,055	8,350	9,720
Navarro Junior College	14,957	7,866	10,482
Odessa Junior College System	16,374	9,000	11,841
Panola College	11,950	8,450	10,058
Paris Junior College	10,300	6,500	8,980
Ranger Junior College	10,700	7,400	8,978
San Antonio College	16,900	7,200	10,417
San Jacinto College	19,340	9,324	10,140
South Plains College	11,900	8,100	10,058
Southwest Texas Junior College	11,250	8,500	9,488
Tarrant County Junior College	13,940	8,100	10,536
Temple Junior College	12,475	7,200	9,335
Texarkana College	12,550	8,410	10,407
Texas Southmost College	13,385	8,235	9,274
Tyler Junior College	14,100	5,175	9,247
Vernon Regional Junior College	10,570	8,082	8,800
Victoria College	13,491	9,648	11,685
Weatherford College	11,900	7,100	9,631
Western Texas College	12,766	8,440	9,601
Wharton County Junior College	15,350	7,050	10,813
State Weighted Average			$ 10,032

SOURCE: Institutional data reported to the Coordinating Board. 12/7/72

NOTE: Data include salaries of full and part-time faculty personnel in general academic courses only. (Part-time personnel equated to equivalent full-time positions.)

* No full-time academic faculty employed.

Table 64

Number of State Employees by Race and Average Pay for State Employees by Race*

Total Employees	118,055
White	94,353
Spanish-Surname	10,653
Black	11,911
Other	1,138
Average Pay	
White Male	$8,582
Black Male	4,855
Spanish Surname Male	5,930
White Female	5,537
Black Female	4,518
Spanish Surname Female	4,682

Percentage of State Employees Making Over $14,147

**All White Males------------------------- (Spanish Surname included in this category)	9%
All Blacks---------------------------------	3.8%

"Building Service" (Employment In) Jobs

All Blacks	48.3
**All Whites (including Spanish Surname)	28.5

**(Includes Spanish Surname).
* Source: Houston Chronicle, April 10, 1973

Table 65
Proportion of Blacks and Mexican-Americans in 20 Key State Agencies*

	1968 Blacks	1972 Blacks	1968 M-As	1972 M-As
Alcoholic Beverage Commission	0.9	2.3	17.4	22.7
Animal Health Commission	0	0.5	1.1	1.4
Attorney General	2.5	2.3	2.0	1.8
Board of Control	29.1	23.6	1.9	5.0
Department of Corrections	1.8	4.1	2.2	2.6
Department of Public Safety	1.5	1.6	3.1	3.7
Department of Public Welfare	2.7	7.2	12.6	16.7
General Land Office	4.2	4.2	2.6	2.3
Mental Health and Mental Retardation	12.8	16.1	7.8	9.5
Parks and Wildlife Department	0.7	0.8	4.2	6.2
Secretary of State	1.6	2.2	3.2	9.8
State Comptroller Department	0.7	0.7	3.0	3.2
State Health Department	10.9	6.7	19.0	17.5
Texas Agriculture Department	2.0	2.4	9.3	3.5
Texas Ed. Agency	9.5	13.8	7.3	5.9
Texas Employment Commission	4.5	7.9	7.5	14.0
Texas Highway Department	1.7	2.1	17.1	12.0
Texas Youth Council	11.5	11.4	1.0	2.8
Water Development Board	1.0	1.4	1.0	8.9
Water Quality Board	0	1.4	2.6	2.3

* Source: Houston Post, November 26, 1972.

Table 66

Educational Attainment of Employed Persons by Occupation, Ethnic Group, and Sex

(Percent distribution)

MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP	Less Than 4 Years High School Completed					4 Years or More High School Completed				
			WHITE					WHITE		
	TOTAL	BLACK	Total	Spanish American	Other White	TOTAL	BLACK	Total	Spanish American	Other White
Men, 18 years and over										
Number	19,600	11,400	8,200	5,300	2,900	8,200	5,400	2,800	900	1,800
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White Collar	8.2	8.0	7.4	5.7	10.3	31.7	26.4	42.3	(3)	50.0
Professional and Technical	1.0	.9	1.2	0.0	0.0	9.8	7.5	15.4	(3)	16.7
Managers, Officials, and Proprietors	3.1	2.7	2.5	1.9	6.9	7.3	5.7	7.7	(3)	11.1
Clerical and Sales	4.1	4.4	3.7	3.8	3.4	14.6	13.2	19.2	(3)	22.2
Blue Collar	77.9	76.1	81.5	84.9	75.9	56.1	60.4	50.0	(3)	44.4
Craftsmen and Foremen	19.0	12.4	28.4	24.5	34.5	15.9	13.2	23.1	(3)	22.2
Operatives	34.4	34.5	34.6	37.7	31.0	28.0	32.1	19.2	(3)	16.7
Nonfarm Laborers	24.6	29.2	18.5	22.6	10.3	12.2	15.1	7.7	(3)	5.6
Service Workers	13.3	15.9	11.1	9.4	13.8	11.0	13.2	7.7	(3)	5.6
Farm Workers	.5	.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(3)	0.0
Women, 18 years and over										
Number	12,000	8,800	3,200	1,900	1,300	7,500	5,600	1,900	600	1,300
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White Collar	14.9	9.0	31.3	22.2	38.5	48.0	37.5	80.0	(3)	75.0
Professional and Technical	1.7	1.1	3.1	5.6	0.0	12.0	12.5	15.0	(3)	16.7
Managers, Officials, and Proprietors	3.3	2.2	6.3	5.6	7.7	2.7	1.8	5.0	(3)	8.3
Clerical and Sales	9.9	5.6	21.9	11.1	30.8	33.3	23.2	60.0	(3)	50.0
Blue Collar	19.0	15.7	28.1	38.9	15.4	9.3	8.9	5.0	(3)	8.3
Craftsmen and Foremen	.8	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	(3)	0.0
Operatives	17.4	13.5	28.1	38.9	15.4	8.0	8.9	5.0	(3)	8.3
Nonfarm Laborers	.8	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(3)	0.0
Service Workers	66.1	75.3	40.6	38.9	46.2	42.7	53.6	15.0	(3)	16.7
Farm Workers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(3)	0.0

---

(3) Percent distribution is not shown where base of percentage is 1,000 or below.

Table 67

Educational Attainment of Workers by Ethnic Group, Age, and Sex

(Percent distribution)

CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE	Total		No School Years Completed	Elementary		High School		College		Median Years Completed
	Number	Percent		1-7 yrs.	8 yrs.	1-3 yrs.	4 yrs.	1-3 yrs.	4 yrs. or more	
Both sexes, 18 years and over										
All persons..........	52,300	100.0	2.5	26.6	9.0	29.4	22.4	6.9	3.3	10.2
Black................	34,500	100.0	1.2	22.1	8.1	33.1	23.8	8.1	3.5	10.7
White................	17,800	100.0	4.5	35.6	10.2	22.6	19.8	4.5	2.8	9.0
Spanish American...	10,000	100.0	7.9	44.6	9.9	20.8	13.9	2.0	1.0	7.6
Other White........	7,800	100.0	1.3	22.5	10.0	26.3	26.3	7.5	6.3	10.9
Men, 25 years and over										
All persons..........	24,300	100.0	3.3	34.2	9.9	25.1	17.3	6.6	3.7	9.3
Black................	14,800	100.0	1.4	29.1	10.1	29.1	19.6	7.4	3.4	10.0
White......	9,500	100.0	6.3	42.1	9.5	18.9	13.7	5.3	4.2	8.2
Spanish American...	5,200	100.0	9.6	53.8	9.6	15.4	9.6	1.9	0.0	6.2
Other White........	4,300	100.0	0.0	27.9	11.6	23.3	20.9	7.0	9.3	10.3
Women, 25 years and over										
All persons..........	17,500	100.0	2.3	25.7	8.0	31.4	22.9	5.7	4.0	10.3
Black................	13,100	100.0	1.5	23.7	7.6	33.6	22.9	6.1	4.6	10.5
White................	4,400	100.0	6.8	31.8	9.1	22.7	22.7	4.5	2.3	9.3
Spanish American...	2,200	100.0	9.1	45.5	9.1	22.7	13.6	0.0	0.0	7.3
Other White........	2,300	100.0	0.0	17.4	13.0	26.1	30.4	8.7	4.3	11.2

FOOTNOTES

[1] "What the Schools Cannot Do," *Time Magazine*, April 16, 1973, pp. 78-85.

[2] "Education," *The Negro Handbook* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company (1966)), pp. 128-29.

[3] See: *Ross versus Eckels*, as President of the Board of Trustees of the Houston Independent School District, Civil Action No. 10444 (August 7, 1970).

[4] During this time Mexican-Americans were not classified as a distinct minority group. They were counted as white. On August 24, 1972, this status changed; Mexican-Americans are now considered to be a separate minority and/or ethnic group.

[5] A Reprint of the Federal District Court decree ordered by the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit on June 1, 1970.

[6] David J. Armor, "The Effects of Busing," *Public Interest* (Summer, 1972).

[7] *Ibid*.

[8] *Ibid*.

[9] *Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research*, A Publication of the Center for National Policy Research, VI, No. 3 (September, 1972), pp. 1-3.

[10] Frederick Mosteller, et. a., *On Equality of Educational Opportunity* (New York: Vintage Books, 1972).

[11] *Op. Cit.*, *Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research*, p. 1.

NOTES AND SELECTED REFERENCES

Notes

A. Most of the data used in this section of the report were obtained from a review of court cases relating to desegregation litigation in the Houston Independent School District. A desegregation factor analysis, not included in this study, shows trends which point toward resegregation. Left undisturbed, the Houston school system will become resegregated within the next seven years.

B. An overall consideration of the figures from the various statistical studies examined shows certain obvious errors with respect to figures relative to the "equi-distant" plan. The figures shown for the freedom of choice plan are taken from the most current reports on enrollment and are accurate; figures for the equi-distant plan were based on projections.

C. Presently, the equi-distant, geographic-capacity, and a modified freedom of choice plan are being used to desegregate the Houston school system. (As stated by the Reverent D. Leon Everett, member of the Houston School Board, "the equi-distant plan is used at the elementary level and the geographic-capacity plan is being used at the secondary level.)

Other References

Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data of Institutions of Higher Education. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Report, Office of Civil Rights, Fall, 1970.

Bureau of the Census. Reports on socio-economic, housing, and general population characteristics.

The Texas Association of College Teachers Bulletin, XXV, No. 2, (January-March, 1973), 6-8.

Houston Independent School District. Published reports on enrollment, teachers, and pupils by race and school.

Annual Report of the Attendance Department, 1971-72. Unpublished report of the Houston Independent School District.

CHAPTER 3

HOUSING NEEDS AND MINORITY GROUPS

This section of the report provides information on housing as revealed through surveys of minority group members and organizations, census reports, news articles, and other statistical reports on the subject. Deliberate efforts were made to determine whether there are housing problems in Houston and the extent to which the problems (if they exist) have racial overtones. We interviewed a selected number of respondents from the general population, real estate and lending institutions, and social welfare organizations in the City of Houston. The efforts and collection of opinions indicate the existance of certain generalizations concerning the housing problem under study. Some of the assumptions are: (1) housing practices are unfair throughout Houston; (2) there is a housing shortage of low to medium income housing; (3) there exist evidence of discriminatory selection of realtors to handle property of white sellers; (4) federal programs have been largely ineffective in meeting the housing needs of minority groups in the city; and (5) agencies and individuals involved in the federal housing programs are under suspicion by the minority community. It should be noted that these assumptions are representative of certain charges made by individuals and organizations.

The preceding generalizations will be examined within the framework of attitudes set forth by the interviews conducted. Statistical information will also be used in the interest of providing greater understanding of the housing situation as it currently exists in Houston and the larger Houston community.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSING

Advanced age of buildings, a large proportion of substandard dwellings, and a high degree of overcrowdedness are generally standard characteristics of housing in the highly delineated areas of minority group concentration. Data from the last decennial census on the condition of housing for the United States show corraborative evidence of the existence of sub-standard housing. "For the entire country, the proportion of black households lacking some or all plumbing facilities is more than three times the proportion for white households."[1] Between 1960 and 1970, the difference in the proportion of housing units with complete plumbing facilities between black and white households was reduced considerably, however.

In 1970, home ownership rates among black households in thirty of the cities with the largest black population ranged from 16 percent in Newark, New Jersey, to 55.0 percent in

Kansas City, Missouri. Proportionate representation of blacks in housing which lacked basic plumbing facilities ranged from 14.6 percent in Jacksonville, Florida, to less than two percent in Baltimore, Maryland.

For Houston, the ownership rate for blacks was 45 percent, with 55 percent listed as renters. Most households in Houston had all plumbing facilities. In fact, 96 percent of occupied units had all plumbing, with four percent lacking some or all plumbing facilities. Table 68 shows a breakdown of tenure and plumbing facilities for black occupied units in thirty cities with the largest black populations in 1970.

Subsequent tables in this chapter show the value of owner occupied housing units in Houston with a black head of household ranged from $9,400 to $17,000. There was a consistent increase in the value of black homes when measured in terms of median dollars from 1950 through March of 1970. The increase was a little more than $2,000 for each three year intervals, beginning with 1960 and during the period commonly referred to as the "Social Revolutions of the '60's." Houses less than $10,000 in median dollar value for blacks in Houston were built prior to 1940, more than thirty years ago. The greater proportion of blacks own homes valued at less than $20,000. In addition, the greater proportion of homes valued between $20,000 and $34,999 was built during the period, 1968-1970. Recent surveys on housing

Table 68

Tenure and Plumbing Facilities for Negro Occupied Units, for 30 Cities With the Largest Negro Population: 1970

Selected cities	Total occupied units	Percent of occupied units			
		Tenure		Plumbing facilities	
		Owner	Renter	With all plumbing	Lacking some or all plumbing facilities
New York City, N.Y.......	523,789	16	84	96	5
Chicago, Ill............	314,640	24	76	95	5
Detroit, Mich...........	192,902	51	49	98	2
Philadelphia, Pa........	194,955	47	53	97	3
Washington, D.C.........	164,040	27	73	98	2
Los Angeles, Calif.......	170,684	32	68	98	2
Baltimore, Md...........	114,095	30	70	98	2
Houston, Texas..........	89,991	45	55	96	4
Cleveland, Ohio.........	86,474	38	62	97	3
New Orleans, La.........	74,336	27	73	94	6
Atlanta, Ga.............	71,166	37	63	97	3
St. Louis, Mo...........	73,230	31	69	92	8
Memphis, Tenn...........	63,207	42	58	94	6
Dallas, Texas...........	57,892	44	56	98	3
Newark, N.J.............	60,446	16	84	95	5
Indianapolis, Ind........	38,177	49	51	95	5
Birmingham, Ala.........	36,247	42	58	94	6
Cincinnati, Ohio........	40,287	27	73	95	5
Oakland, Calif..........	39,645	40	60	97	3
Jacksonville, Fla.......	32,689	55	45	85	15
Kansas City, Mo.........	33,678	55	45	96	4
Milwaukee, Wis..........	27,540	33	67	97	3
Pittsburgh, Pa..........	33,712	33	67	92	8
Richmond, Va............	29,891	41	59	94	6
Boston, Mass............	31,854	18	83	96	5
Columbus, Ohio..........	29,449	43	57	98	2
San Francisco, Calif.....	32,500	25	75	94	6
Buffalo, N.Y............	27,963	29	71	98	2
Gary, Ind...............	24,861	50	50	94	6
Nashville-Davidson, Tenn.	24,222	40	60	91	9

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

in Houston show that there is a gradual but steady movement of young blacks between the ages of 25 and 35 years into homes in middle class neighborhoods. These homes are valued in price from $25,000 to $35,000.

As shown in the income section, there is some evidence to suggest that a substantial proportion of blacks, when measured in terms of income, occupation, and education, have moved from lower middle to middle class status. This mobility was related to a rise in individual and family income. The ratio of black family income to that of whites made a substantial and significant change during the last decade. The middle-income group in this category has made significant progress in Houston. A substantial proportion of this group lives in the Houston suburbs. They occupy homes in Fort Bend County, Southwest Houston, the traditional Third Ward Area, Scenic Woods, and many are found to be living in Hidden Valley as well as Sharpstown. Some occupy apartments; most are home owners. It should be noted, however, that some families did encounter insults and discrimination in this physical mobility. Specific instances will be cited in the discussion on "Discrimination in Housing."

Residential mobility is a slippery and uncertain concept. Blacks are confronted with a uniquely different situation when they seek to advance in American society. This is true in Houston as well as other parts of the country. Despite the upward gains made in income, employment, and education, residential mobility is still largely a result of the ecological processes of invasion and succession. As blacks begin to move into some areas of Houston, whites make their flight to other areas -- usually further out into the suburbs. The ecological processes of invasion and succession defy any tendency toward integrated neighborhoods in Houston for any sustained period of time. Integration, like invasion, has an ecological existence which is dependent upon a sustained relationship between the incoming group and existing clientele. Human communities are governed by basic organizational and cohesive forces which define the basic mode of human adjustment. Where blacks come in contact with whites in neighborhood situations, blacks are more often viewed as outsiders. Illustrative of this tendency is a letter which appeared in the Houston Post (April 25, 1973):

> . . .I enjoyed reading. . . "How to buy a house if you're Black. . ." However, the main point was neither discussed or explained. Why should a black wish to move where his neighbors do not want him, where he will never be accepted, no matter what. Whites do not force themselves where they are not wanted.

Historical distoritons and misconceptions about blacks make it difficult, and in many ways almost impossible, for whites to accept them as neighbors. And, the tendency to view blacks primarily as a single, undifferentiated mass of disadvantaged people tied by the badge of color is revelaed in contacts with realtors and sellers.

DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING

Racial understanding has been further inhibited by the fact that realtors, builders, and lending institutions in Houston utilize different standards and techniques in dealing with potential black buyers. This fact is revealed through interviews conducted with a cross-section of the black community in Houston.

Some of the problems encountered by Houstonians, in general, were discussed in a recent article published in the Houston Post (April 15, 1973). In this article, Columnist John F. Powers discussed critical issues relating to the sale and financing of homes. "Members of minority groups face the same problems as whites in finding a house and financing it -- and then some," says Powers. The extra problems of minority groups stem from encounters with real estate brokers, builders, and lending institutions. When confronted with discriminatory practices, some potential black buyers will simply change realty agencies. Others will seek redress through the courts. A United States Justice suit was filed against Gary Greene Realtors Company. Now this agency agrees not to discriminate in the sale of housing in a federal court consent decree. The Justice Department alleged the company "steered and channeled" prospective white and black customers to predominantly white and black areas, respectively. This firm denied the allegations, saying it had promoted fair housing programs and policies in its sale of homes. Other such suits have also been filed against realty companies in Houston.

In talking with a selected number of black realtors in Houston, we were able to ascertain some of the problems experienced in finding adequate and suitable housing for the black population. One real estate salesman had this to say: "Lower income people have trouble getting financing for homes in the under $10,000 range because discrimination still exists in this area. By law Houston is an open city, but steering blacks to particular areas like Dumbarton Oaks and Brentwood is a common practice. White realtors will not show property in certain areas to blacks..." Another black realtor indicated that there is less shortage of homes for lower and middle income blacks at this time because of the 235 and 236 homes. Apartment construction and inflationary trends have also reduced the demand for housing in this category. "But," he said, "the upper income levels have trouble. White brokers don't sell homes in the $35,000 and above range to blacks. So, it is your black executives -- those who come in from out of town with companies -- who have the trouble. They have trouble buying in the old established neighborhoods such as Candlelight Forest, Braeburn Valley, Tanglewood, and Hunters Creek, for example." Several other persons interviewed felt that even when a white broker shows a house to a black in exclusive white neighborhoods, he is treated so coldly that the pride of the buyer precludes his having any further interest in the property. Other complaints were also aired, including the sale of property at exorbitant prices to slow the flow of blacks into certain neighborhoods, high appraisals of homes so that the white sellers get higher equities than normally expected for the same priced house, and "for sale by owners" techniques, where, if the person chooses to sell his home himself, he can sell to whoever he wishes. Many black realtors and potential customers share the belief that housing laws can only be applied to the realtor who discriminates.

There are additional complications in the path of lower and middle income minority group members. Several techniques of salesmanship used by some real estate agencies are insulting to blacks. One sales technique used largely by white realtors may be called "racial exclusiveness." They make sales appeals on the basis of the number of educated blacks living in the area. This pitch is to let the potential buyer know that the area is in transition from a predominantly white neighborhood to a black one; and that they want to make sure that you live with people of your own kind. The snob appeal is carried further if the individual's race is not known. Where telephone contact is made, the white salesman or seller wants to know your place of employment, total income, and your present location. If the individual has lower middle class status, he is not shown homes in the $25,000 to $35,000 range. The real estate brokers react to the real estate market for whites, but they try to create artificial ones for blacks by arousing or appealing to prejudices in developing communities and the old established ones. "Blockbusting" occurs in Houston. Some new developments, by design and intent, are built for blacks only. Consequently, the showing of these homes is limited to black patrons only.

Another technique used by white realtors, if the seller is black, is to tell the potential buyer that the owner is losing his home or that he has a second mortgage on the property. One black couple moved from Dallas to Houston late in 1972. The real estate salesman showed them several homes in some parts of Houston. The couple had indicated the type of floor plan they wanted. Eventually the house was located but the occupants were black. This couple was told that the owner was losing his home, only to find later that the owner had sufficient funds, credit, and property to maintain the home. The seller had wanted a large home, and he had bought the house in a previously all-white area.

Newcomers and the middle income blacks are more often victims of discrimination because they can afford to buy homes in traditionally non-black areas. Blockages are set up by realtors through misquoted higher prices and "sold" signs when blacks insist on being taken into better neighborhoods. Outlandish prices are quoted by some white sellers; others will remain in a neighborhood after it gets to be 98 percent black in hopes of making greater profits.

The young black executive has even more of a problem when it comes to finding suitable housing in Houston. The better all-black areas are stable. It is difficult, if not impossible, to find adequate housing in Timbercrest, Riverside Terrance, and Brentwood West. Windor Village is gradually becoming black. For the most part, the homes in Westbury are priced too high for what the buyer gets for his money. The South Park area, adjoining Sunnyside, has long been overcrowded. With the advent of South Park Village and the Selinsky Apartments, few middle and upper middle class blacks will move in the area because the deed restrictions have been violated and the area is overimpacted where traffic is virtually at a standstill during peak hours.

Where corporate headquarters are located in outlying areas of metropolitan centers, blacks are faced with problems when they find themselves in suburbs which do not favor renting or selling to blacks. This is not the case in Houston, although some difficulty exists in this regard. Blacks live in outlying areas of the city, but the question of location in relation to community acceptance is another matter. However, another dimension to the issue of location is that many corporations have begun to conduct pilot or feasibility studies to determine community receptiveness to all its employees. This trend will tend to reduce the amount of discrimination and accompanying anxieties in this regard because the decisions to locate plants and facilities often rest on the potent factor of housing availability.

LOW INCOME HOUSING

Low income housing and public housing projects lie at the heart of attempts to provide affirmative action to eradicate slum areas in the city. Black community groups, in cooperation with the Model Cities Agency, are seeking means by which inner city areas can be redeveloped. In the central city, the problem of housing is, and will remain for years, acute unless concerted efforts are launched to ebb the tide of physical deterioration.

Federal subsidized housing, once considered a potential panacea, has seldom measured up to advanced expectations and most often has created new and growing problems for the low income group. A community planner for the Houston Urban League discussed the problem of low income housing with our survey group. She states:

> Although the city and federal governments have made commitments to the creation of housing for lower income people, nothing is currently being done beyond tokenism. The problem of housing is being approached from the vantage point of privilege. Those who have the money and the right skin color get the housing. It is my belief that the situation will continue to exist until the problem is approached from the standpoint of what is right, -- in the interest of the general welfare of the city -- it can never be solved.

The representative from the Urban League of Houston also pointed out that programs have been in existence for the lower income persons such as the public housing projects and rent supplement programs. All the others, including the 235 and 236 programs have been for the moderate income persons, not for the low income group, as the public has been led to believe.

Closely related to public housing facilities for the low income group is the initiation of urban renewal or highway construction projects. An important aspect of urban renewal in the minds of low income residents is the prospect of clearance of all or part of an area. When black low income persons are faced with relocation problems, they usually result from decisions made outside of the community. Relocation rarely shows imagination or creativity in improving areas or fostering integration into previously all-white areas. Black low income persons are usally relocated in areas traditionally occupied by blacks or they are found on fringe areas of low-income white communities. In each instance, the ghetto remains intact.

What usually happens when black low income areas are threatened with displacement or relocation is the development of a total plan and inadequate, purposely abbreviated discussion of it in the community affected. After this takes place, blacks are simply moved out of the areas involved. No planning for new public housing takes place. Generally, they are dispersed around the first and second rings of the central business district and one finds the ghetto has not disappeared but it was merely transplanted into another section of Houston. The movement of blacks from Third and Fourth Wards into Sunnyside and South Park is an illustrative case. Low income blacks remain restricted by virtue of their status and their race. As to solutions, Stegman panits a rather gloomy picture; "Today, the public housing program goes without its traditional liberal and intellectual support; it goes without union support; and it goes without any broad demand among the electorate. And as for the poor, they go without decent housing..." The author of "The New Mythology of Housing" made these comments in 1970.[2] There is evidence to indicate that as late as 1973 he is still right in this assertion. In Houston some neighborhood development programs are in progress in black communities and other minority areas, but the housing needs of the poor are still not being adequately met.

HOUSING CODE ENFORCEMENT

A report, published by the Texas Urban Development Commission and prepared by several University of Houston professors, indicates that two methods of enforcement are employed by the Houston Housing Code Enforcement Section. These include: "systematic and individual complaints." The authors further point out that "systematic code enforcement involves designation of certain areas and then a dwelling-by-dwelling inspection by evaluators."[3] Each approach has as its aim the improvement of entire neighborhoods through code enforcement. The report also points out that systematic code enforcement is limited to Model Neighborhoods while individual complaints cover the total city.

In black neighborhoods, code enforcement is not applied equally in all areas. Physical deterioration is widespread in many minority areas of Houston. In many cases, inspectors report what can be seen on the surface. Rats and rodent infestation goes unnoticed. The 1972 Comprehensive Plan for the Model City Department of the City of Houston contains several functional problem areas of the Physical Environmental component. Housing conditions were considered to be a high priority item in the plan. Specific housing conditions were listed as: (1) high frequency of substandard housing; (2) lack of low-income housing resources; (3) lack of coordination of effort on the part of the city; and (4) lack of available loans for repairs. There is some evidence to suggest that many of the problems listed here still exist in Houston, although some progress has been made in rehabilitating sections of low income areas. Indicators of progress in this regard include the upgrading of about 4100 dwelling units to meet the minimum housing standards through the Code Enforcement programs. Of the total upgrades, about 109 were financed through the "Rehabilitation Revolving Fund." A substantial number of structures have also been demolished through the Model Cities "Demolition of Unsafe Buildings" program. There are still many more structures in need of complete demolition. Street lights have been installed in some model neighborhoods.

One of the basic goals of the Model Cities program was to increase the supply of standard housing available to indigenous residents of Model Neighborhoods and in other areas in which they want to live and at costs they can afford. This goal has not been fully achieved. Again, low income persons are not receiving the benefits of adequate and decent housing in the City of Houston. Even the agency admits that "there have been few perceptible changes in the physical appearance of Houston's fourteen (14) square mile inner city since the Model Cities program was implement.[4] This statement was made in 1972. It could be that some progress has been made since then.

However, as late as March 15, 1973, Houston's inner city area included in the Model Cities program (Model Neighborhood area) contained 33,000 dwelling units of which 39 percent are in violation of the city's "Minimum Housing Code." Of these an estimated 3,000 units are unfit for habitation. The report states, "in light of these facts, there is an evident need for an aggressive program of demolition of unsafe structures and a mechanism to provide housing rehabilitation loans to those Model Neighborhood residents who are unable to obtain loans through conventional means due to low income or poor credit."

Cut off from the "conventional" sources of financing, the black low income resident is either forced to deal with highly questionable speculators or he must buy on a contractual basis for a period of years at higher interest rates. If the low income person chooses the "contract basis" he can be evicted and dispossessed within a short time, if he defaults on a payment. The speculator can then re-sell the property. A Social Planner for the Houston Urban League talked with us about this practice in Houston. She related cases where blacks are being sold homes in Windsor Village, located in Southwest Houston. White realtors are putting people in homes ranging in prices from $19,000 to $28,000. Some of these individuals do not have money or credit to pay the prices asked for the homes. "They are buying under something called "contract sales," said the Planner. She further stated that they do not have a clear understanding of what is going on and "they have merely accepted the realtor's word and they think they are buying a house. Actually they are renting." One student at Texas Southern University corroborated this story by stating that she was placed in a house under similar condition, because the realtor wanted to protect the white owner's credit. Other cases involved obvious acts of discrimination and block busting,--tactics used in frightening white owners into selling through a campaign of claiming that the neighborhood is turning black and house values are declining.

There has been a great deal of serious study of various types of housing in Houston and of the reactions of residents to their living environments. One such study was conducted by the Urban Resources Center at Texas Southern University. The study's aim was to determine the extent to which Housing Code Enforcement in Houston contributed to better living conditions for low income blacks. Over 100 homes were selected at random from low income areas. The Housing Code used by Houston was utilized in inspecting homes and assessing the physical condition of the dwellings. In addition, the occupants were interviewed on particular questions concerning the neighborhood in general. Using the Houston Housing Code as a source, a checklist of the standards was devised for measuring conditions of housing in the sampling area. In the study, it was found that the most crucial problem was plumbing. Other defective conditions, not covered in the Houston Housing Code, were found. Of all dwellings surveyed, 13 percent had rusty or rotten screens on the windows; ten percent had no wall-type convenience electrical outlets; eight percent needed interior papering or paneling; and 6 percent of the homes had broken windows. Because of unkept vacant lots and buildings, the areas are found to be plagued with rodents, insects, and other pests. Over 80 percent of the renters included in this study complained of poor maintenance habits by the absentee landlords.[5] All respondents indicated that there is need for comprehensive planning in the four neighborhoods -- Third, Fourth, and Fifth Wards and Acres Homes -- surveyed.

The need for planning on a neighborhood basis cannot be gainsaid. A federation of program components which touch every aspect of a living environment is needed. "Controls such as deed restrictions, capacities of water and sewer services, access and site requirements" are emphases stressed in the 1973 Community Development Statement for the City of Houston. The report further acknowledges that housing is a priority issue in Houston. The 1970 Census shows that there are approximately 54,000 households with incomes below the standard set by the Office of Economic Opportunity. About 50,000 families live in substandard housing, many of which are elderly and/or renters. Houston does not have a sufficient number of public housing units to accommodate the number of persons in need. The local housing authority has estimated a need for 10,000 additional units of federally-assisted low rent housing. Our survey of low income neighborhoods in 1973 indicated that this figure is too low. Adjustments for condemnations and demolitions must be included in the estimated figure.

From the aforementioned discussions, the following are some concerns expressed by minority community residents:

1. Moderate and upper income blacks should devise methods where unscrupulous realtors, brokers, and lending institutions can be made known to potential buyers in this income bracket.

2. Slum dwellers should be educated about the bureaucracy. Slum residents are often pawns of bureaucrats in urban renewal and highway programs.

3. Minority groups should carefully investigate any builders whose appeal is beamed to them exclusively. Prices are usually exorbitant, guarantees are few, and workmanship is generally poor.

4. Low income renters should especially be aware of the "turning process." All too often the owner of an apartment building decides to increase his profit by shifting to low-income-minority group occupancy while reducing services and increasing the number of rent payers in the same place. The technique is time-tested. It was the case in the Palm Center area of Houston; along the Eastex Freeway; and in the South Park area. The owner moves minority group families into apartments and immediately reduces the level of maintenance. This serves to drive whites out. The result is a gradual development of new slums.

5. Black potential buyers should be very careful about housing inspection and appraisals conducted by real estate companies. It is an observed fact that most middle and upper middle class blacks are much more affluent than thier white predecessors . In many instances, they pay more for homes in areas of transition than they would in a new development. White

appraisers will often list numerous items in need of repair, if the seller is black; they overlook similar defects if the seller is white.

6. Black real estate companies should organize in the interest of providing credibility of the shelter business in Houston. There is need for sustained counseling with low income persons about the concept of "contract buying." These recommendations do not carry racial overtones. The intent is to protect the "victim" from being abused, and the logical means would be through knowledgeable real estate agents.

7. Whites pay a terrific economic and social cost for discrimination in housing. Panic selling, inflammatory actions and disturbing rumors take tolls among low income dwellers, and suburbanites move from place to place in quest of "lily white" areas only to find that with each move, they lose money and credits. The block busting techniques are carefully designed by the real estate industry to create new, higher profit markets. There is evidence that similar techniques are practiced in Houston. Many of the homes in BrentWood, Keswick Place, and Cambridge Village went up for sale after cards were placed in mailboxes warning owners that the areas were turning black. Houses in these areas have changed owners from two to five times during the past five years.[6]

Immediate Actions Areas

1. The federal Fair Housing law should be applied uniformly in all parts of the city. An Affirmative action program should be implemented which would insure integrated housing and destroy the dual market for housing in Houston. Restrictive convenants have no place in this democracy, in Houston, in the rent, purchase, or sale of housing.

2. The involvement of intelligent citizens in matters of community planning and development is essential, if we are to move housing availability from narrow interests into broader interests for the total community.

3. In dealing with housing inadequacy, dialogue in needed between the planners, local government officials, federal agencies, and community residents concerning the critical state of housing in the city.

4. Building codes, health regulations, and housing code enforcement are essentials in efforts to eliminate unsuitable living environments in black areas. The Housing Code for Houston is in need of serious overhauling, and vigorous enforcement in deteriorating neighborhoods in needed. Housing Code enforcement must also take into consideration shelter supply because of the possibility that some buildings might be condemned.

Finally, housing is one of the areas which contributes to continues segregation in Houston. Anti-busing advocates insist on open housing as an alternative to the busing of school children from their immediate neighborhoods. Yet, few of the persons who participate in marches against the busing of school children will lift their voices in support of open housing in Houston and elsewhere. Many of these same citizens are aware of acts of discrimination in housing, and few, if any, will extend the hand of friendship and cooperation to black neighbors. The future of Houston depends in large measure on effective, open housing practices; a common market for housing rather than a dual one; and aggressive administrative action on the part of city officials to insure equal justice in housing, education, employment, health, and related areas for the entire citizenry.

Tables 69 through 83 give data on owner occupied dwellings in Houston and the total SMSA. Selected characteristics on appliances, gross rental rates, housing values, household composition, age of structures, and gross percentages of income spent on housing by income level, and sex of household head are also given for occupied dwellings.

Table 69

VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS: 1970

ITEM	Total	%	Less than $5,000	%	$5,000 to $7,499	%	$7,500 to $9,999	%	$10,000 to $12,499	%	$12,500 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $19,999	%	$20,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 to $34,999	%	$35,000 to $49,999	%	$50,000 or More	Median (Dollars)
Income in 1969																						
Less than $2,000	22,669	18.0	4,166	21.0	4,675	18.0	4,077	16.0	3,604	8.0	1,735	9.0	2,147	4.0	918	3.0	665	2.0	4.8	1.00	264	9,000
$2,000 to $2,999	11,011	14.0	1,529	19.0	2,065	22.0	2,402	16.0	1,799	9.0	971	10.0	1,089	4.0	508	3.0	352	2.0	192	.90	104	9,500
$3,000 to $3,999	10,784	11.0	1,233	19.0	2,019	20.0	2,158	19.0	2,048	10.0	1,095	12.0	1,245	4.0	418	3.0	330	1.0	164	.60	74	10,000
$4,000 to $4,999	11,251	9.0	1,039	17.0	1,967	20.0	2,254	19.0	2,161	11.0	1,252	13.0	1,499	5.0	517	3.0	379	1.0	135	.40	48	10,400
$5,000 to $5,999	12,972	9.0	1,123	16.0	2,041	19.0	2,479	20.0	2,649	12.0	1,581	13.0	1,670	5.0	709	3.0	446	2.0	196	.60	78	10,800
$6,000 to $6,999	14,803	7.0	1,042	15.0	2,177	21.0	3,075	21.0	3,133	12.0	1,809	13.0	1,856	5.0	760	4.0	636	1.0	177	.90	138	10,900
$7,000 to $9,999	59,594	4.0	2,304	10.0	6,257	18.0	10,528	21.0	2,507	15.0	8,754	19.0	11,266	7.0	4,375	4.0	2,446	1.0	863	.50	294	12,100
$10,000 to $14,999	99,891	1.0	1,421	4.0	4,865	11.0	10,535	17.0	16,903	15.0	14,541	23.0	23,521	15.0	4 651	10.0	9,978	3.0	2,568	.90	908	15,300
$15,000 to $24,999	69,130	.5	355	2.0	1,194	5.0	3,191	9.0	6,216	5.0	6,361	19.0	13,557	9.0	12,917	22.0	15,463	11.0	7,659	3.00	2,217	21,400
$25,000 or more	21,767	.3	66	.8	180	1.0	297	2.0	536	3.0	628	8.0	1,797	10.0	2,242	22.0	4,681	24.0	5,227	28.00	6,113	36,300
Median	$11,200		$4,200		$6,400		$8,200		$ 9,500		$10,700		$11,900		$13,700		$16,600		$20,300		$31,500	...
Year Moved Into Unit:																						
1969 to March 1970	43,241	2.0	1,010	5.0	2,069	8.0	3,294	11.0	4,615	10.0	4,245	19.0	8,289	15.0	6,846	17.0	7,232	9.0	3,812	4.00	1,802	18,700
1968	32,191	2.0	743	5.0	1,504	8.0	2,633	11.0	3,654	11.0	3,511	19.0	6,099	16.0	5,038	16.0	5,057	8.0	2,654	4.00	1,298	18,200
1967	24,447	2.0	568	5.0	1,325	10.0	2,453	14.0	3,304	10.0	2,547	19.0	4,706	14.0	3,532	15.0	3,598	6.0	1,523	4.00	891	16,900
1965 and 1966	43,089	3.0	1,240	6.0	2,661	9.0	4,050	14.0	5,990	11.0	4,762	20.0	8,538	13.0	5,802	14.0	5,831	7.0	2,918	3.00	1,297	16,600
1960 to 1964	63,926	4.0	2,325	8.0	4,851	11.0	7,128	15.0	9,589	11.0	7,139	19.0	12,046	12.0	7,808	11.0	7,219	6.0	3,623	3.00	2,207	15,300
1950 to 1959	87,439	5.0	4,621	10.0	8,551	15.0	13,168	19.0	16,674	14.0	12,323	18.0	15,545	8.0	6,619	6.0	5,283	3.0	2,538	2.00	2,027	12,600
1949 or earlier	39,618	9.0	3,724	17.0	6,645	21.0	8,218	20.0	7,891	10.0	4,004	12.0	4,730	5.0	2,028	3.0	1,118	1.0	616	2.00	644	10,400
Heating Equipment:																						
Steam or hot water	1,714	7.0	127	8.0	141	16.0	276	17.0	290	10.0	169	12.0	208	7.0	116	9.0	147	5.0	93	9.00	147	12,800
Warm-air furnace	190,913	.3	635	1.0	2,272	3.0	7,198	10.0	18,390	12.0	23,272	25.0	46,881	18.0	33,809	17.0	32,491	8.0	16,402	5.00	9,563	19,600
Built-in electric units	5,845	2.0	142	5.0	313	10.0	591	18.0	1,025	13.0	741	21.0	1,205	14.0	797	10.0	613	5.0	283	2.00	135	15,400
Floor, wall, or pipeless furnace	26,024	2.0	632	9.0	2,255	22.0	5,748	33.0	8,558	17.0	4,518	11.0	2,920	3.0	696	2.0	523	.5	143	3.00	31	11,300
Other means	109,085	12.0	12,664	21.0	22,391	25.0	27,139	21.0	23,262	9.0	10,012	8.0	8,399	2.0	2,586	1.0	1,597	.6	673	.30	362	9,300
None	291	27.0	78	23.0	68	15.0	44	11.0	31	5.0	15	12.0	34	3.0	11	2.0	5	2.0	5	-	-	7,500
Air Conditioning:																						
Room Unit(s)	148,355	3.0	4,490	10.0	14,588	19.0	27,457	25.0	37,658	17.0	25,558	17.0	25,916	5.0	7,367	2.0	3,574	.7	1,181	.30	566	11,800
Central system	136,398	.1	232	.6	826	2.0	2,448	5.0	6,166	7.0	9,767	22.0	30,664	21.0	29,281	23.0	31,256	12.0	16,337	.00	9,421	23,100
None	49,108	19.0	9,509	25.0	12,219	22.0	11,039	16.0	7,893	7.0	3,206	7.0	3,373	2.0	1,025	1.0	499	.3	166	.30	179	8,100

Table 69 (Cont.)

VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS: 1970

ITEM	Total	%	Less than $5,000	%	$5,000 to $7,499	%	$7,500 to $9,999	%	$10,000 to $12,499	%	$12,500 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $19,999	%	$20,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 to $34,999	%	$35,000 to $49,999	%	$50,000 or More	Median (Dollars)
Year Structure Built:																						
1969 to March 1970	13,558	1.0	147	1.0	104	2.0	235	2.0	285	3.0	424	21.0	2,826	22.0	2,965	28.00	3,754	14.0	1,952	6.0	786	24,500
1965 to 1968	47,962	1.0	499	2.0	733	2.0	1,029	4.0	2,055	8.0	3,634	21.0	10,152	22.0	10,498	23.00	10,831	12.0	5,914	5.0	2,625	22,800
1960 to 1964	53,914	2.0	918	3.0	1,774	6.0	3,098	10.0	5,508	11.0	5,678	22.0	11,934	17.0	9,308	17.00	9,105	8.0	4,422	4.0	2,360	19,200
1950 to 1959	122,968	3.0	4,134	7.0	8,641	13.0	16,458	20.0	24,798	16.0	19,476	19.0	23,798	9.0	10,770	7.00	8,383	3.0	3,817	2.0	2,713	13,500
1940 to 1949	54,221	8.0	4,514	17.0	9,434	22.0	12,037	21.0	11,322	11.0	5,765	11.0	5,729	4.0	2,387	3.00	1,537	1.0	702	1.0	709	10,200
1939 or earlier	41,229	10.0	4,066	16.0	6,674	20.0	8,139	18.0	7,588	9.0	3,750	13.0	5,208	5.0	2,095	4.00	1,766	2.0	792	3.0	1,151	10,600
Complete Bathrooms:																						
1 and 1 ½	197,461	5.0	10,402	13.0	24,800	19.0	37,736	24.0	46,902	16.0	32,265	17.0	32,860	3.0	7,817	2.00	3,530	.4	795	.2	385	11,400
2 and 2 ½	118,162	2.0	233	.8	947	2.0	2,180	3.0	4,131	5.0	5,956	22.0	26,516	25.0	29,281	26.00	30,341	12.0	14,632	3.0	3,985	23,300
3 or more	13,436	1.0	16	.2	26	.1	11	.7	77	9.0	100	3.0	319	4.0	460	13.00	1,362	22.0	2,249	56.0	5,816	50,000+
None or also used by another household	7,802	46.0	3,580	24.0	1,860	13.0	1,017	8.0	607	3.0	210	3.0	258	1.0	115	1.00	96	.1	8	.6	51	5,400
Household Composition:																						
Two-or-more person households	305,096	4.0	10,850	7.0	22,725	12.0	35,902	15.0	46,424	12.0	35,719	18.0	55,967	12.0	36,400	11.00	34,222	6.0	17,033	3.0	9,896	15,100
Male head, wife present, no nonrelatives:	272,530	3.0	8,347	7.0	18,382	11.0	30,757	15.0	40,822	12.0	32,199	19.0	50,834	12.0	34,014	12.00	32,259	6.0	15,929	3.0	8,987	15,500
Under 25 years	6,315	4.0	224	9.0	575	14.0	906	20.0	1,270	16.0	986	21.0	1,341	10.0	673	4.00	260	.7	50	.5	30	13,000
25 to 34 years	56,849	1.0	832	5.0	2,615	9.0	5,126	14.0	8,219	13.0	7,499	23.0	12,975	16.0	9,320	13.00	7,146	4.0	2,450	1.0	667	16,400
35 to 44 years	74,253	2.0	1,449	5.0	3,666	10.0	7,071	14.0	10,276	12.0	8,969	18.0	13,625	13.0	9,937	15.00	10,797	8.0	5,669	3.0	2,794	16,900
45 to 64 years	110,078	3.0	3,763	8.0	8,393	12.0	13,450	15.0	16,896	11.0	12,226	18.0	19,305	11.0	12,078	11.00	12,364	6.0	6,911	4.0	4,892	15,100
65 years and over	25,035	8.0	2,079	13.0	3,133	17.0	4,204	17.0	4,161	10.0	2,519	14.0	3,580	8.0	2,006	7.00	1,692	3.0	899	3.0	888	11,900
Other male head:	9,061	7.0	608	13.0	1,143	15.0	1,371	16.0	1,436	16.0	880	16.0	1,494	8.0	709	7.00	654	4.0	349	4.0	417	12,500
Under 65 years	7,677	6.0	450	11.0	853	15.0	1,124	16.0	1,200	10.0	794	18.0	1,369	8.0	649	8.00	576	4.0	312	4.0	388	13,200
65 years and over	1,384	11.0	158	21.0	290	18.0	247	17.0	236	6.0	86	9.0	125	4.0	60	6.00	78	3.0	37	5.0	67	10,000
Female head:	23,505	8.0	1,895	14.0	3,200	16.0	3,774	18.0	4,166	11.0	2,640	15.0	3,639	7.0	1,685	6.00	1,309	3.0	756	2.0	842	11,700
Under 65 years	18,675	7.0	1,282	13.0	2,338	16.0	2,998	18.0	3,369	12.0	2,214	16.0	2,946	8.0	1,624	6.00	1,112	3.0	678	1.0	314	12,000
65 years and over	4,830	13.0	613	18.0	862	16.0	776	17.0	797	9.0	426	14.0	693	5.0	261	4.00	197	2.0	77	2.0	128	10,500
One-person households:	28,776	12.0	3,428	16.0	4,715	18.0	5,094	18.0	5,132	10.0	3,088	13.0	3,660	6.0	1,607	3.00	1,154	2.0	586	1.0	382	10,600
Under 65 years	15,887	10.0	1,560	15.0	2,375	16.0	2,522	19.0	3,039	11.0	1,772	15.0	2,309	7.0	1,045	.41	667	2.0	[illegible]	1.0	225	11,200
65 years and over	12,889	14.0	1,868	18.0	2,340	20.0	2,572	16.0	2,093	10.0	1,236	10.0	1,331	4.0	562	4.0	497	2.0	223	1.0	167	9,700

Table 70

VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH NEGRO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD 1970

ITEM	Total	Less Than $5,000	%	$5,000 to $7,499	%	$7,500 to $9,999	%	$10,000 to $12,499	%	$12,500 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $19,999	%	$20,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 to $34,999	%	$35,000 to $49,999	%	$50,000 or More	%	Median (Dollars)
Year Structure Built																						
1969 to March 1970	670	5	.74	20	3.0	35	5.0	10	1.0	74	11.0	322	48.0	112	17.0	81	12.00	11	2.00	-	-	17,700
1965 to 1968	2,156	34	2.00	60	3.0	121	6.0	366	17.0	478	22.0	733	33.0	220	10.0	110	5.00	30	1.00	4	.18	15,100
1960 to 1964	4,294	70	2.00	329	8.0	678	16.0	1,141	27.0	839	19.0	916	21.0	238	5.0	56	1.00	16	.37	11	.25	12,300
1950 to 1959	16,890	114	4.00	2,345	14.0	4,092	24.0	4,685	28.0	2,570	15.0	1,771	10.0	373	2.0	186	1.00	84	.49	70	.41	10,700
1940 to 1949	8,590	937	11.00	2,039	24.0	2,063	24.0	1,625	19.0	714	8.0	743	9.0	256	2.0	137	2.00	56	.65	20	.23	9,100
1939 or earlier	5,306	622	12.00	1,139	21.0	1,212	23.0	940	17.0	405	8.0	662	12.0	197	3.0	143	2.00	39	.72	27	.50	9,400
Complete Bathrooms																						
1 and 1 ½	32,361	1,769	5.00	5,239	16.0	7,761	24.0	8,254	26.0	4,453	14.0	3,673	11.0	720	2.0	321	1.00	116	.35	55	.16	10,400
2 and 2 ½	3,965	37	.93	108	3.0	264	7.0	412	10.0	500	13.0	1,621	40.0	646	16.0	278	7.00	74	2.00	25	.63	16,900
3 or more	166	-	-	11	6.0	11	6.0	6	4.0	8	5.0	4	3.0	25	15.0	23	14.00	26	16.00	52	31.00	32,800
None or also used by another household	1,544	512	33.00	471	31.0	180	12.0	155	10.0	52	3.0	96	6.0	34	2.0	13	84	8	.51	23	1.00	6,400
Household Composition																						
2 or more person households	33,599	1,814	5.00	4,804	15.0	7,227	22.0	7,957	23.0	4,743	14.0	4,710	14.0	1,300	4.0	633	2.00	214	.63	117	.34	10,900
Male head, wife present, no nonrelatives	26,865	1,201	4.00	3,568	13.0	5,661	21.0	6,569	24.0	3,985	15.0	3,940	15.0	1,136	4.0	561	2.00	156	.58	88	.32	11,100
Under 25 years	725	15	2.00	92	13.0	110	15.0	188	26.0	130	18.0	152	20.0	20	3.0	13	2.00	5	.68	-	-	11,900
25 to 34 years	5,544	86	2.00	392	7.0	961	17.0	1,542	28.0	1,177	21.0	1,035	18.0	271	5.0	74	1.00	-	-	6	.10	12,200
35 to 44 years	7,253	180	2.00	843	12.0	1,409	19.0	1,958	27.0	1,267	17.0	1,072	15.0	313	4.0	125	2.00	56	.77	30	.41	11,500
45 to 64 years	10,134	531	5.00	1,612	16.0	2,427	23.0	2,301	22.0	1,169	12.0	1,346	13.0	373	4.0	265	3.00	74	.73	36	.35	10,500
65 years and over	3,209	389	12.00	629	20.0	754	23.0	580	18.0	242	6.0	335	10.0	159	5.0	84	3.00	21	.65	16	.49	9,400
Other male heads	1,684	135	8.00	321	19.0	417	24.0	313	19.0	189	11.0	202	12.0	46	3.0	31	2.00	19	1.00	11	.65	9,800
Under 65 years	1,350	99	7.00	251	19.0	345	26.0	270	20.0	153	11.0	159	12.0	41	3.0	17	1.00	15	1.00	-	-	9,900
65 years and over	334	36	11.00	70	21.0	72	22.0	43	13.0	36	11.0	43	13.0	5	1.0	14	4.00	4	1.00	11	3.00	9,600
Female head	5,050	478	9.00	995	20.0	1,149	23.0	1,075	21.0	569	11.0	568	11.0	118	2.0	41	.81	39	.77	18	.35	9,800
Under 65 years	4,119	340	8.00	787	19.0	953	23.0	924	22.0	494	12.0	440	11.0	97	2.0	41	1.00	34	.82	9	.21	9,900
65 years and over	931	138	15.00	208	22.0	196	21.0	151	16.0	75	8.0	128	14.0	21	2.0	-	-	5	.53	6	.96	9,000
One-person households	4,387	568	13.00	1,048	24.0	974	22.0	810	18.0	337	8.0	437	10.0	96	2.0	80	2.00	22	.50	15	.38	9,000
Under 65 years	2,620	270	10.00	560	21.0	560	21.0	555	21.0	235	9.0	302	12.0	60	2.0	52	2.00	11	.41	15	.57	9,600
65 years and over	1,767	298	17.00	488	27.0	414	23.0	255	14.0	102	6.0	135	8.0	36	2.0	28	2.00	11	.62	-	-	8,100

Table 70 (Cont.)

VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH NEGRO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD 1970

ITEM	Total	Less Than $5,000	%	$5,000 to $7,499	%	$7,500 to $9,999	%	$10,000 to $12,499	%	$12,500 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $19,999	%	$20,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 to $34,999	%	$35,000 to $49,999	%	$50,000 or More	%	Median (Dollars)
Income in 1969																						
Less than $2,000	5,353	867	16.00	1,333	25.0	1,193	22.0	945	18.0	342	6.0	443	8.0	96	2.0	49	.91	49	.91	38	.67	8,500
$2,000 to $2,999	2,375	265	11.00	532	22.0	684	29.0	414	17.0	213	9.0	142	6.0	62	3.0	44	2.00	13	.54	6	.25	8,900
$3,000 to $3,999	2,441	219	9.00	490	20.0	625	26.0	572	23.0	230	9.0	222	9.0	35	1.0	29	1.00	8	.32	11	.45	9,500
$4,000 to $4,999	2,299	155	7.00	509	21.0	510	22.0	527	23.0	282	12.0	247	11.0	29	1.0	35	2.00	-	-	5	.21	9,900
$5,000 to $5,999	2,712	236	9.00	436	16.0	667	25.0	667	25.0	301	10.0	286	10.0	79	3.0	29	1.00	11	.40	-	-	10,100
$6,000 to $6,999	3,084	189	6.00	502	16.0	737	24.0	920	30.0	351	11.0	251	8.0	51	2.0	68	2.00	10	.32	5	.16	10,300
$7,000 to $9,999	9,283	285	3.00	1,269	13.0	2,130	23.0	2,346	25.0	1,480	16.0	1,303	14.0	256	3.0	140	2.00	60	.64	14	.15	11,000
$10,000 to $14,999	7,396	125	2.00	643	9.0	1,330	17.0	1,826	25.0	1,314	18.0	1,552	21.0	432	6.0	121	2.00	45	.60	8	.10	12,200
$15,000 to $24,999	2,670	36	1.00	201	8.0	285	11.0	510	19.0	526	20.0	600	22.0	320	12.0	142	5.00	35	1.00	15	.56	13,900
$25,000 or more	373	5	1.00	17	5.0	40	11.0	40	11.0	41	11.0	101	26.0	36	10.0	56	15.00	5	1.00	32	9.00	16,700
Median	$7,200	$3,300		$5,200		$6,600		$7,400		$8,700		$9,300		$11,000		$9,200		$8,400		$7,600		...
Year Moved into Unit																						
1969 to March 1970	4,668	121	3.00	403	9.00	607	13.0	1,137	23.0	892	19.0	1,081	23.0	272	6.0	130	3.00	18	.38	7	.14	12,700
1968	3,273	130	4.00	334	10.00	595	18.0	786	24.0	642	20.0	510	16.0	199	6.0	47	1.00	20	.61	10	.30	11,800
1967	2,991	71	2.00	272	9.00	719	24.0	803	24.0	515	17.0	461	15.0	69	2.0	57	2.00	12	.40	12	.40	11,300
1965 and 1966	4,468	120	3.00	458	10.00	782	18.0	1,250	27.0	713	16.0	759	17.0	217	5.0	113	3.00	36	.80	-	-	11,700
1960 to 1964	5,728	355	6.00	999	17.00	1,303	23.0	1,346	23.0	614	11.0	776	14.0	190	3.0	76	1.00	27	.47	42	.73	10,400
1950 to 1959	11,587	858	7.00	1,942	17.00	2,884	24.0	2,568	22.0	1,308	11.0	1,352	12.0	332	3.0	186	2.00	91	.78	66	.56	10,100
1949 or earlier	5,341	663	12.00	1,421	26.00	1,326	24.0	937	18.0	329	6.0	455	9.0	146	3.0	26	.48	20	.37	18	.33	8,600
Heating Equipment																						
Steam or hot water	570	83	15.00	77	14.00	112	20.0	103	18.0	73	13.0	65	11.0	15	3.0	10	2.00	16	2.00	16	2.00	10,300
Warm-air furnace	11,724	67	.57	366	3.00	1,307	11.0	2,864	23.0	2,598	22.0	3,031	26.0	881	8.0	436	4.00	113	.96	61	.52	13,700
Built-in electric units	1,081	59	5.00	50	5.00	203	19.0	260	24.0	200	19.0	175	16.0	76	7.0	33	3.00	25	2.00	-	-	12,200
Floor, wall or pipeless furnace	2,332	64	3.00	251	11.00	551	24.0	787	34.0	361	15.0	236	10.0	57	2.0	26	1.00	-	-	-	-	11,800
Other means	22,205	2,095	10.00	5,170	23.00	6,019	27.0	4,748	21.0	1,838	8.0	1,629	7.0	361	2.0	208	.93	82	.36	55	.24	9,100
None	73	14	19.00	18	25.00	9	12.0	5	7.0	10	14.0	11	15.0	6	8.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Air Conditioning																						
Room unit(s)	19,909	629	3.00	2,517	13.00	4,729	24.0	5,693	28.0	3,110	16.0	2,345	12.0	556	3.0	244	1.00	98	.49	28	.14	10,900
Central system	5,559	39	.70	101	2.00	394	7.0	745	13.0	967	17.0	2,101	38.0	727	13.0	321	6.00	97	2.00	67	1.00	16,000
None	12,528	1,650	13.00	3,211	25.00	3,093	25.0	2,389	19.0	936	7.0	948	8.0	142	1.0	70	.55	29	.23	60	.47	8,600

Table 71

VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD OF SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH SURNAME: 1970

ITEM	Total	Less than $5,000	%	$5,000 to $7,499	%	$7,500 to $9,999	%	$10,000 $12,499	%	$12,500 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $19,999	%	$20,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 to $34,999	%	$35,000 to $49,999	%	$50,000 or More	%	Median (Dollars)
Year Structure Built:																						
1969 to March 1970	182	-	-	-	-	7	4.0	-	0	6	3.0	55	30.0	30	16.0	46	25.0	25	14.0	13	7.0	23,800
1965 to 1968	1,120	-	-	34	3.0	41	4.0	76	7.0	105	9.0	200	18.0	270	24.0	189	17.0	150	13.0	55	5.0	21,900
1960 to 1964	1,745	23	1.0	85	4.0	154	9.0	205	12.0	231	13.0	393	23.0	195	11.0	254	15.0	136	8.0	69	4.0	16,800
1950 to 1959	5,062	136	3.0	499	11.0	937	19.0	1,212	24.0	862	17.0	849	17.0	202	4.0	210	4.0	86	2.0	69	1.0	12,000
1940 to 1949	3,767	219	6.0	1,050	28.0	1,050	28.0	692	18.0	325	9.0	258	7.0	73	2.0	44	1.0	35	.5	21	.5	9,000
1939 or earlier	3,219	246	8.0	658	20.0	970	30.0	659	20.0	275	9.0	275	9.0	46	1.0	41	1.0	15	1.0	34	1.0	9,300
Complete Bathrooms:																						
1 and 1 ½	11,179	561	5.0	2,091	18.0	2,873	25.0	2,520	23.0	1,477	13.0	1,343	12.0	210	2.0	84	1.0	14	.1	6	.1	10,100
2 and 2 ½	3,315	24	1.0	97	3.0	205	6.0	283	9.0	290	9.0	673	20.0	601	18.0	657	20.0	374	11.0	111	3.0	20,700
3 or more	268	-	-	11	4.0	-	-	-	0	10	4.0	7	3.0	-	-	43	16.0	59	22.0	138	51.0	50,000+
None or also used by another household	333	39	12.0	127	38.0	81	24.0	41	12.0	27	8.0	7	2.0	5	2.0	-	-	-	-	6	2.0	7,900
Household Composition:																						
Two-or-more-person households	14,463	535	4.0	2,192	15.0	3,011	21.0	2,739	19.0	1,777	12.0	1,981	14.0	770	5.0	769	5.0	434	3.0	255	2.0	11,400
Male head, wife present, no nonrelatives	12,801	431	3.0	1,811	14.0	2,596	20.0	2,438	19.0	1,635	13.0	1,837	14.0	734	6.0	712	6.0	397	3.0	210	2.0	11,600
Under 25 years	399	11	2.0	74	19.0	116	29.0	37	9.0	80	20.0	58	15.0	6	2.0	17	4.0	-	-	-	-	10,000
25 to 34 years	3,038	77	2.0	359	12.0	692	23.0	710	23.0	386	13.0	442	15.0	187	6.0	103	3.0	70	2.0	12	.4	11,400
35 to 44 years	4,324	104	2.0	480	11.0	896	21.0	761	17.0	640	15.0	606	14.0	288	7.0	334	8.0	133	3.0	81	2.0	12,200
45 to 64 years	4,198	185	4.0	659	16.0	749	18.0	737	18.0	449	11.0	692	16.0	220	5.0	240	6.0	169	4.0	98	2.0	11,700
65 years and over	842	54	6.0	239	28.0	143	17.0	193	23.0	80	10.0	39	5.0	32	4.0	18	2.0	25	3.0	19	2.0	9,700
Other male head	568	30	5.0	109	19.0	144	25.0	85	15.0	46	8.0	68	12.0	8	1.0	33	6.0	-	-	45	8.0	10,000
Under 65 years	468	15	3.0	80	17.0	125	27.0	71	15.0	38	8.0	68	15.0	-	-	26	5.0	-	-	45	10.0	10,500
65 years and over	100	15	15.0	29	29.0	19	19.0	14	14.0	8	8.0	-	-	8	8.0	7	7.0	-	-	-	-	8,300
Female head	1,094	74	7.0	272	25.0	271	25.0	216	20.0	96	9.0	76	7.0	28	2.0	24	2.0	37	3.0	-	-	9,400
Under 65 years	908	58	6.0	231	25.0	211	23.0	168	19.0	81	9.0	70	8.0	28	3.0	24	3.0	37	4.0	-	-	9,500
65 years and over	186	16	9.0	41	22.0	60	32.0	48	26.0	15	8.0	6	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,000
One-person households	632	89	14.0	134	21.0	148	23.0	105	17.0	27	4.0	49	8.0	46	7.0	15	2.0	13	2.0	6	1.0	9,100
Under 65 years	351	31	9.0	64	18.0	74	21.0	67	19.0	20	6.0	27	8.0	46	13.0	8	2.0	8	2.0	6	2.0	10,200
65 years and over	281	58	21.0	70	25.0	74	26.0	38	14.0	7	2.0	22	8.0	-	-	7	2.0	5	2.0	-	-	7,900

Table 71 (Cont.)

VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD OF SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH [redacted]: 1970

	Total	Less than $5,000	%	$5,000 to $7,499	%	$7,500 to $9,999	%	$10,000 to $12,499	%	$12,500 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $19,999	%	$20,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 to $34,999	%	$35,000 to $49,999	%	$50,000 or More	%	Median (Dollars)
Income in 1969:																						
Less than $2,000	863	41	16.0	242	28.0	103	22.0	127	15.0	52	6.0	40	5.0	40	5.0	14	2.0	8	.9	6	.7	8,100
$2,000 to $2,999	422	24	6.0	117	28.0	146	35.0	63	15.0	25	6.0	21	4.0	16	4.0	-	-	5	1.0	5	1.0	8,700
$3,000 to $3,999	511	61	12.0	130	25.0	113	22.0	89	17.0	59	12.0	37	7.0	7	1.0	-	-	15	3.0	-	-	8,900
$4,000 to $4,999	647	46	7.0	182	28.0	111	26.0	123	19.0	46	7.0	59	9.0	15	2.0	5	1.0	-	-	-	-	8,900
$5,000 to $5,999	913	51	6.0	237	26.0	220	24.0	167	18.0	110	12.0	66	7.0	36	4.0	6	1.0	14	1.0	6	.6	9,400
$6,000 to $6,999	963	63	7.0	220	23.0	286	30.0	199	21.0	63	6.0	95	10.0	-	-	31	3.0	6	.6	-	-	9,200
$7,000 to $9,999	3,610	97	3.0	714	20.0	980	27.0	839	23.0	396	11.0	419	12.0	52	1.0	72	2.0	41	1.0	8	-	10,100
$10,000 to $14,999	4,321	107	2.0	358	8.0	866	20.0	885	20.0	732	17.0	783	18.0	313	7.0	214	5.0	66	2.0	17	.4	12,400
$15,000 to $24,999	2,262	26	1.0	106	5.0	190	8.0	310	14.0	308	14.0	456	20.0	311	14.0	308	15.0	146	6.0	61	3.0	16,000
$25,000 or more	515	8	1.0	20	4.0	14	2.0	42	7.0	13	2.0	54	9.0	26	5.0	94	16.0	146	25.0	156	28.0	36,700
Median	$9,700	$5,800		$7,100		$8,400		$9,300		$11,000		$11,800		$13,900		$16,400		$19,700		$31,000		-
Year Moved into Unit:																						
1969 to March 1970	1,929	49	2.0	191	10.0	404	21.0	299	15.0	288	15.0	287	15.0	133	7.0	163	8.0	64	3.0	50	3.0	12,700
1968	1,448	45	3.0	134	9.0	237	16.0	307	21.0	250	18.0	175	12.0	88	6.0	114	8.0	72	5.0	25	2.0	12,500
1967	1,391	46	3.0	93	7.0	265	19.0	341	24.0	132	9.0	230	17.0	45	3.0	147	11.0	42	3.0	42	3.0	12,100
1965 and 1966	2,586	138	5.0	323	13.0	521	20.0	503	19.0	279	11.0	324	13.0	232	9.0	129	5.0	80	3.0	40	2.0	11,900
1960 to 1964	3,028	61	2.0	469	16.0	626	20.0	562	18.0	373	12.0	440	15.0	173	6.0	149	5.0	110	4.0	49	2.0	11,600
1950 to 1959	3,115	158	5.0	616	20.0	723	23.0	550	18.0	382	12.0	431	14.0	117	4.0	64	2.0	38	1.0	27	1.0	10,300
1949 or earlier	1,598	127	8.0	509	31.0	383	24.0	273	17.0	90	6.0	127	8.0	36	2.0	18	1.0	24	2.0	20	1.0	8,000
Heating Equipment:																						
Steam or hot water	226	13	6.0	27	12.0	52	23.0	54	23.0	25	11.0	19	8.0	25	11.0	-	-	6	3.0	5	2.0	11,000
Warm-air furnace	5,303	19	.3	72	1.0	346	6.0	716	14.1	880	17.0	1,321	25.0	601	11.0	694	12.0	402	8.0	266	5.0	17,000
Built-in electric units	481	8	2.0	46	10.0	78	16.0	88	19.0	68	14.0	54	11.0	84	17.0	27	6.0	21	4.0	6	1.0	13,200
Floor, wall or pipeless furnace	1,143	29	2.0	62	5.0	291	25.0	310	27.0	292	26.0	132	12.0	30	2.0	7	.6	-	-	-	-	11,500
Other means	7,027	555	7.0	2,111	27.0	2,385	30.0	1,675	21.0	531	7.0	504	6.0	86	1.0	56	.7	18	.2	6	.1	8,900
None	15	-	-	8	53.0	7	47.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Air Conditioning:																						
Room unit(s)	7,786	165	2.0	982	13.0	1,790	23.0	1,906	25.0	1,361	17.0	1,176	15.0	191	2.0	70	1.0	46	1.0	12	.1	11,200
Central system	3,161	7	.2	30	1.0	100	3.0	174	5.0	290	8.0	667	21.0	598	19.0	700	22.0	386	13.0	263	8.0	23,000
None	4,148	452	11.0	1,304	31.0	1,260	30.0	686	16.0	196	5.0	197	5.0	27	1.0	6	.1	6	.1	6	.1	8,100

Table 72

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION FOR OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS: 1970

ITEM	Total	%	Male Head, Wife Present, No Nonrelatives												Other Male Head				Female Head				One Person Household	
			Under 25 Years	%	25 to 34 Years	%	35 to 44 Years	%	45 to 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income By Income: Specified Renter Occupied	238,447	12.0	28,238	20.0	47,923	9.0	23,717	11.0	26,502	3.0	6,900	5.0	11,971	.3	804	12.0	29,209	1.0	2,310	20.0	47,583	6.0	13,390	
Less than $5,000:	84,174	10.0	8,012	7.0	5,955	4.0	3,538	6.0	5,305	4.0	3,352	5.0	4,479	.6	504	21.0	17,839	2.0	1,515	27.0	22,509	13.0	11,166	
Less than 20 percent	6,873	10.0	691	10.0	710	7.0	456	11.0	746	5.0	330	5.0	358	.6	43	15.0	1,020	1.0	97	30.0	2,069	5.0	353	
20 to 24 percent	7,092	10.0	768	10.0	738	7.0	521	10.0	720	5.0	382	4.0	324	.6	40	18.0	1,254	1.0	72	25.0	1,760	7.0	513	
25 to 35 percent	15,888	12.0	1,915	9.0	1,527	5.0	858	8.0	1,253	4.0	688	3.0	543	.4	67	20.0	3,111	2.0	256	26.0	4,119	10.0	1,551	
35 percent or more	45,572	9.0	4,282	6.0	2,696	3.0	1,440	5.0	2,072	3.0	1,518	6.0	2,836	.6	282	23.0	10,693	2.0	856	26.0	12,004	15.0	6,893	
Not computed	8,749	4.0	356	3.0	284	3.0	263	6.0	514	5.0	434	5.0	418	.8	72	20.0	1,761	3.0	234	29.0	2,557	21.0	1,856	
$5,000 to $9,999:	89,579	16.0	14,526	24.0	21,196	11.0	9,465	10.0	9,204	2.0	1,986	5.0	4,660	.1	169	10.0	8,830	.6	538	19.0	17,478	2.0	1,527	
Less than 20 percent	48,763	17.0	8,069	26.0	12,491	13.0	6,105	13.0	6,275	2.0	1,062	4.0	2,144	.2	106	6.0	3,130	.6	287	17.0	8,469	1.0	625	
20 to 24 percent	19,174	18.0	3,453	24.0	4,689	8.0	1,628	7.0	1,348	2.0	303	5.0	891	.1	22	10.0	1,930	.3	65	23.0	4,500	2.0	345	
25 to 34 percent	14,770	16.0	2,413	20.0	2,906	7.0	1,001	5.0	743	2.0	283	7.0	1,054	.1	21	16.0	2,373	.7	105	24.0	3,563	2.0	308	
35 or more percent	4,107	9.0	350	14.0	569	7.0	309	8.0	311	3.0	131	11.0	453	.2	10	28.0	1,151	.5	24	15.0	617	4.0	182	
Not computed	2,765	9.0	241	20.0	541	15.0	422	19.0	527	7.0	207	4.0	118	.3	10	9.0	246	2.0	57	12.0	329	2.0	67	
$10,000 to $14,999:	43,713	11.0	4,926	35.0	15,218	15.0	6,764	15.0	6,434	2.0	781	4.0	1,967	.1	69	4.0	1,861	.3	164	12.0	5,152	.8	377	
Less than 20 percent	37,452	12.0	4,571	35.0	13,182	15.0	5,622	14.0	5,350	2.0	577	4.0	1,574	.7	64	4.0	1,508	.4	143	12.0	4,655	.5	206	
20 to 24 percent	3,748	6.0	234	37.0	1,375	20.0	739	12.0	460	2.0	93	6.0	232	-	-	6.0	212	.2	9	8.0	333	2.0	61	
25 or more percent	1,199	4.0	44	31.0	369	16.0	186	10.0	127	4.0	55	11.0	132	.4	5	7.0	82	-	-	9.0	109	7.0	90	
Not computed	1,314	6.0	77	22.0	292	17.0	217	38.0	497	4.0	56	2.0	29	-	-	4.0	59	.9	12	4.0	55	2.0	20	
$15,000 or More	20,981	4.0	774	26.0	5,554	19.0	3,950	26.0	5,559	3.0	681	4.0	865	.3	62	3.0	679	.4	93	13.0	2,444	1.0	320	
Less than 20 percent	19,556	4.0	764	27.0	5,296	19.0	3,676	26.0	5,057	3.0	608	4.0	841	.3	52	3.0	647	.4	71	12.0	2,357	1.0	237	
20 to 24 percent	588	-	-	22.0	129	27.0	158	26.0	153	4.0	23	2.0	11	-	-	2.0	10	2.0	10	7.0	43	8.0	51	
25 or more percent	234	-	-	11.0	26	12.0	27	38.0	88	14.0	34	2.0	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.0	22	14.0	32	
Not computed	603	2.0	10	17.0	103	23.0	139	43.0	261	2.0	16	1.0	8	2.0	10	47.0	22	2.0	12	4.0	22	-	-	

Table 73

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION FOR OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH NEGRO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD: 1970

ITEM	Total	%	Male Head, Wife Present, No Nonrelatives										Other Male Head				Female Head				One Person Household			
			Under 25 Years	%	25 to 34 Years	%	35 to 44 Years	%	45 to 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income by Income: Specified Renter Occupied[2]	48,110	9.0	4,156	16.0	7,634	10.0	4,727	10.0	4,771	2.00	1,177	5.0	2,523	.59	284	22.0	10,768	2.00	807	18.0	8,835	5.00	2,428
Less than $5,000:	27,642	6.0	1,688	7.0	1,935	5.0	1,314	7.0	1,813	2.00	825	5.0	1,286	.76	212	32.0	8,726	2.00	642	25.0	6,842	9.00	2,359
Less than 20 percent	2,258	7.0	158	9.0	195	6.0	133	8.0	191	3.00	78	7.0	152	1.00	29	26.0	579	2.00	39	28.0	642	3.00	62
20 to 24 percent	2,771	6.0	185	10.0	285	9.0	244	12.0	322	3.00	84	6.0	161	.79	22	23.0	649	2.00	41	24.0	666	4.00	112
25 to 34 percent	5,900	9.0	525	9.0	560	7.0	395	8.0	496	3.00	169	5.0	269	.25	15	30.0	1,741	1.00	117	22.0	1,326	5.00	287
35 percent or more	14,438	5.0	744	6.0	829	3.0	492	5.0	688	3.00	451	4.0	596	.85	124	35.0	5,085	2.00	380	24.0	3,501	10.00	1,548
Not computed	2,275	3.0	76	3.0	66	2.0	50	5.0	116	2.00	43	5.0	108	.96	22	29.0	672	3.00	65	31.0	707	15.00	350
$5,000 to $9,899:	16,106	13.0	2,142	25.0	4,141	17.0	2,660	14.0	2,197	2.00	299	6.0	1,028	.29	48	10.0	1,631	.68	110	11.0	1,781	.42	69
Less than 20 percent	11,651	13.0	1,497	25.0	2,967	17.0	1,978	15.0	1,751	2.00	227	5.0	608	.32	38	10.0	1,142	.88	75	11.0	1,331	.31	37
20 to 24 percent	2,710	15.0	395	29.0	786	17.0	453	10.0	258	1.00	45	7.0	201	-	-	12.0	318	.44	12	8.0	227	.55	15
35 to 34 percent	1,341	16.0	211	24.0	323	15.0	197	7.0	93	1.00	17	14.0	195	.37	5	9.0	122	.89	12	12.0	161	.37	5
35 percent or more	107	9.0	10	23.0	25	-	-	20.0	22	-	-	19.0	19	-	-	8.0	9	6.00	6	9.0	10	6.00	6
Not computed	297	9.0	29	13.0	40	11.0	32	25.0	73	3.00	10	2.0	5	2.00	5	13.0	40	2.00	5	18.0	52	2.00	6
$10,000 to $14,999:	3,459	8.0	273	38.0	1,315	17.0	605	16.0	570	.86	30	4.0	139	.40	14	9.0	299	.80	28	5.0	186	-	-
Less than 20 percent	3,324	8.0	268	38.0	1,271	17.0	589	16.0	526	.75	25	4.0	139	.42	14	9.0	289	.84	28	5.0	175	-	-
20 to 24 percent	14	-	-	64.0	9	36.0	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25 percent or more	11	-	-	-	-	45.0	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55.0	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not computed	110	5.0	5	31.0	35	5.0	6	40.0	44	5.00	5	-	-	-	-	4.0	4	-	-	10.0	11	-	-
$15,000 or more:	903	6.0	53	27.0	243	16.0	148	21.0	191	3.00	23	8.0	70	1.00	10	12.0	112	3.00	27	3.0	26	-	-
Less than 20 percent	878	6.0	53	26.0	232	17.0	148	21.0	186	3.00	23	7.0	65	1.00	10	13.0	112	3.00	27	3.0	22	-	-
20 to 24 percent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25 percent or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not computed	25	-	-	44.0	11	-	-	20.0	5	-	-	20.0	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.0	4	-	-

---

[2] Excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more

Table 74

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION FOR OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD OF SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH SURNAME 1970

ITEM	Total	%	Male Head, Wife Present, No Nonrelatives										Other Male Head				Female Head				One Person Household		
			Under 25 Years	%	25 to 34 Years	%	35 to 44 Years	%	45 to 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over	%	Under 65 Years	%	65 Years and Over
Owner Occupied Housing Units	16,138		488		3,262		4,536		4,379		909		523		120		909		186		429		317
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income By Income:																							
Specified Renter Occupied[2]	19,899	16.0	3,254	27.0	5,387	13.0	2,630	11.0	2,[illegible]	2.0	383	6.0	1,175	.3	76	11.0	2,150	0	113	10.0	2,046	2.0	436
Less than $5,000:	7,292	17.0	1,234	16.0	1,142	8.0	564	8.0	607	2.0	175	7.0	538	1.0	53	19.0	1,361	1.0	58	16.0	1,168	5.0	392
Less than 20 percent	1,135	21.0	240	16.0	187	9.0	106	10.0	116	4.0	42	7.0	64	.6	7	13.0	149	.4	5	15.0	176	4.0	43
20 to 24 percent	935	18.0	171	27.0	255	9.0	83	8.0	75	5.0	45	4.0	40	.7	7	19.0	182	-	-	7.0	73	2.0	24
25 to 34 percent	1,467	18.0	265	21.0	303	10.0	153	9.0	135	2.0	34	5.0	75	1.0	19	15.0	273	.3	5	14.0	201	4.0	54
35 percent or more	3,165	16.0	503	11.0	352	7.0	213	8.0	246	1.0	38	9.0	292	.6	20	22.0	687	1.0	35	17.0	552	7.0	227
Not computed	570	10.0	55	8.0	45	1.0	9	6.0	35	3.0	16	12.0	67	0	-	21.0	120	2.0	13	29.0	166	8.0	64
$5,000 to $9,999:	8,452	20.0	1,653	32.0	2,692	15.0	1,276	11.0	941	1.0	113	5.0	450	.1	15	7.0	574	.3	32	8.0	669	0	37
Less than 20 percent	5,999	19.0	1,149	34.0	2,038	16.0	987	12.0	698	1.0	89	5.0	297	.1	10	5.0	298	.1	16	7.0	409	.1	8
20 to 24 percent	1,269	20.0	249	29.0	365	12.0	157	13.0	174	0	-	7.0	92	0	-	9.0	114	0	-	9.0	111	1.0	7
25 to 34 percent	842	24.0	205	24.0	206	11.0	95	3.0	25	1.0	7	4.0	33	0	-	15.0	125	1.0	11	15.0	127	1.0	8
35 percent ore more	137	16.0	22	30.0	41	5.0	7	6.0	8	7.0	9	11.0	15	0	-	10.0	14	-	-	10.0	14	5.0	7
Not computed	205	13.0	28	24.0	42	15.0	30	18.0	36	3.0	8	6.0	13	2.0	5	11.0	23	2.0	5	3.0	8	3.0	7
$10,000 to $14,999:	3,003	10.0	304	40.0	1,207	18.0	551	15.0	446	1.0	39	4.0	120	.2	8	5.0	154	2.0	23	4.0	144	.2	7
Less than 20 percent	2,782	9.0	263	40.0	1,114	19.0	515	15.0	431	1.0	39	4.0	104	.3	8	5.0	148	1.0	16	5.0	144	0	-
20 to 24 percent	112	19.0	21	43.0	48	32.0	36	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	6.0	7	0	-	-	-
25 percent or more	63	16.0	10	48.0	30	0	-	0	-	0	-	25.0	16	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	11.0	7
Not computed	46	21.0	10	33.0	15	0	-	33.0	15	0	-	0	-	0	-	13.0	6	0	-	0	-	0	-
$15,000 or more:	1,152	5.0	63	30.0	346	21.0	239	22.0	255	5.0	56	6.0	67	0	-	5.0	61	0	-	6.0	65	0	-
Less than 20 percent	1,114	6.0	63	30.0	337	21.0	239	21.0	233	4.0	49	6.0	67	0	-	5.0	61	0	-	6.0	65	0	-
20 to 24 percent	14	0	-	0	-	0	-	50.0	7	50.0	9	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
25 percent or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not computed	24	-	-	37.0	9	-	-	63.0	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

---

[2] Excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more

Table 75

INCOME IN 1969 OF FAMILIES AND PRIMARY INDIVIDUALS IN OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS: 1970

ITEM	Total	%	Less than $2,000	%	$2,000 to $2,999	%	$3,000 to $3,999	%	$4,000 to $4,999	%	$5,000 to $5,999	%	$6,000 to $6,999	%	$7,000 to $9,999	%	$10,000 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 or More	Median (Dollars)
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income:																						
Specified renter occupied:	238,447	13.00	32,825	6.0	15,554	7.0	17,400	7.0	8,395	8.0	19,481	8.0	19,763	21.0	50,335	18.0	43,713	7.00	16,762	2.00	4,219	6,800
Less than 15%	67,714	.05	40	.3	207	.8	555	2.0	1,311	3.0	2,305	5.0	3,706	26.0	17,838	36.0	24,894	19.00	13,080	6.00	3,778	11,600
15 to 19 percent	44,930	.40	162	1.0	439	3.0	1,209	6.0	2,950	9.0	4,305	12.0	5,403	34.0	15,206	28.0	12,558	5.00	2,486	.50	212	8,600
20 to 24 percent	30,602	1.00	422	3.0	866	7.0	2,145	12.0	3,659	14.0	4,306	15.0	4,584	33.0	10,284	12.0	3,748	2.00	549	.10	39	6,900
25 to 34 percent	31,921	4.00	1,382	9.0	3,043	18.0	5,678	18.0	5,785	19.0	5,788	13.0	4,324	15.0	4,658	3.0	1,050	.50	169	.10	44	5,000
35 or more percent	49,849	49.00	24,379	20.0	10,075	14.0	7,109	8.0	4,009	4.3	2,177	2.0	1,168	2.0	762	.2	149	.03	16	.01	5	2,100
Not computed	13,431	48.00	6,440	7.0	924	5.0	704	5.0	681	4.0	600	4.0	578	12.0	1,587	10.0	1,314	37.00	462	1.00	141	2,300
Selected Characteristics:																						
Automatic clothes washing machine	70,326	7.00	4,803	4.0	2,835	5.0	3,871	6.0	3,939	7.0	4,683	8.0	5,388	25.0	17,966	26.0	18,118	10.00	6,930	2.00	1,793	8,600
Clothes dryer	40,268	5.00	1,860	3.0	1,306	5.0	1,844	4.0	1,802	6.0	2,285	6.0	2,648	24.0	9,685	29.0	11,550	14.00	5,765	4.00	1,523	9,600
Dishwasher	61,160	5.00	3,216	2.0	1,498	4.0	2,481	4.0	2,616	5.0	3,323	8.0	4,619	21.0	12,568	28.0	17,228	17.00	10,388	5.00	3,223	10,100
Home food freezer	29,700	9.00	2,739	4.0	1,166	6.0	1,914	6.0	1,667	6.0	1,831	8.0	2,504	23.0	6,759	23.0	6,964	12.00	3,472	2.00	684	8,300
Owned second home	8,994	11.00	960	4.0	346	5.0	503	5.0	439	5.0	470	5.0	456	20.0	1,798	24.0	2,170	15.00	1,332	6.00	520	9,200
With air conditioning	164,245	9.00	14,911	5.0	7,693	6.0	9,350	6.0	10,694	8.0	12,825	8.0	3,834	23.0	37,802	23.0	37,868	9.00	15,304	2.00	3,964	8,000
Room unit(s)	82,985	11.00	9,352	6.0	4,829	7.0	5,595	7.0	6,159	8.0	6,947	9.0	7,831	25.0	20,381	20.0	16,845	5.00	4,394	.80	652	7,100
Central system	81,260	7.00	5,559	4.0	2,864	6.0	3,755	5.0	4,535	7.0	5,878	7.0	6,003	21.0	17,421	26.0	21,023	13.00	10,910	4.00	3,312	9,100
Automobiles available:																						
One	130,370	10.00	13,298	6.0	7,776	7.0	9,760	9.0	1,441	10.0	13,020	10.0	13,344	25.0	32,012	17.0	21,982	5.00	6,205	1.00	1,530	6,700
Two	58,247	4.00	2,381	2.0	1,313	3.0	1,939	4.0	2,500	5.0	3,097	7.0	3,825	24.0	13,831	32.0	18,604	15.00	8,735	3.0	2,022	10,100
3 or more	7,499	6.00	445	3.0	215	4.0	285	5.0	339	4.0	330	6.0	434	18.0	1,362	28.0	2,090	20.00	1,498	6.0	501	10,800

Table 76

INCOME IN 1969 OF FAMILIES AND PRIMARY INDIVIDUALS IN OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH NEGRO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD: 1970

ITEM	Total	Less Than $2,000	%	$2,000 to $2,999	%	$3,000 to $3,999	%	$4,000 to $4,999	%	$5,000 to $5,999	%	$6,000 to $6,999	%	$7,000 to $9,999	%	$10,000 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 or more	%	Median (Dollars)
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income:																						
Specified Renter Occupied	48,110	11,662	24.00	5,582	12.00	5,450	11.0	4,948	10.0	4,377	9.00	3,907	8.00	7,822	16.00	3,459	7.00	761	2.00	142	.29	4,300
Less than 15 percent	10,642	7	.06	90	.84	131	1.0	418	4.3	597	6.00	1,172	11.00	4,378	41.00	2,985	28.00	726	7.00	138	1.00	9,000
15 to 19 percent	7,469	56	.74	141	2.00	427	6.0	988	13.0	1,529	20.00	1,536	20.00	2,439	33.00	339	5.00	14	.18	-	-	6,400
20 to 24 percent	5,495	170	3.00	319	6.00	888	16.0	1,394	25.0	1,278	23.00	739	13.00	693	13.00	14	.25	-	-	-	-	5,000
25 to 34 percent	7,247	380	5.00	1,425	20.00	2,450	33.0	1,645	23.0	803	11.00	380	5.00	158	2.00	6	.08	-	-	-	-	3,700
35 percent or more	14,550	9,164	63.00	3,436	24.00	1,460	10.0	378	2.0	82	.56	20	.13	5	.03	5	.03	-	-	-	-	2,000-
Not computed	2,707	1,885	70.00	171	6.00	94	3.00	125	5.0	88	3.00	60	2.00	149	6.00	110	4.00	21	.77	4	.14	2,000-
Selected Characteristics:																						
Automatic clothes washing machine	7,492	1,003	13.00	732	10.00	796	10.00	597	8.0	781	10.00	737	10.00	1,907	26.00	741	10.00	153	2.00	45	.60	5,800
Clothes dryer	1,867	162	9.00	172	9.00	190	10.00	210	11.0	178	10.00	150	8.00	526	28.00	194	10.00	85	5.00	-	-	6,100
Dishwasher	867	100	12.00	50	6.00	15	2.00	94	11.0	72	8.00	69	8.00	242	28.00	143	16.00	82	9.00	-	-	7,400
Home food freezer	5,781	1,043	18.00	430	7.00	699	12.00	631	11.0	547	9.00	616	11.00	1,178	20.00	431	8.00	185	3.00	21	.36	5,200
Owned second home	1,064	331	31.00	118	11.00	154	14.00	81	8.0	108	10.00	53	5.00	132	12.00	71	7.00	16	2.00	-	-	3,500
With air conditioning	16,725	2,591	15.00	1,453	9.00	1,672	10.00	1,730	10.3	1,530	9.00	1,610	10.00	3,741	22.00	1,940	12.00	396	2.00	62	.37	5,600
Room unit(s)	12,773	1,922	15.00	1,117	9.00	1,348	11.00	1,356	11.0	1,179	9.00	1,310	10.00	2,835	21.00	1,429	11.00	240	2.00	37	.28	5,500
Central system	3,952	669	17.00	336	9.00	324	8.00	374	9.0	351	9.00	300	8.00	908	22.00	511	13.00	156	4.00	25	.63	5,800
Automobiles Available:																						
One	22,123	3,380	15.00	1,860	8.00	2,249	10.00	2,496	11.0	2,472	11.00	2,467	12.00	4,911	22.00	1,844	8.00	370	2.00	74	.33	5,400
Two	4,880	369	8.00	294	5.00	358	7.00	409	8.0	442	9.00	479	10.00	1,321	26.00	1,010	21.00	231	5.00	7	.14	7,300
3 or more	485	60	12.00	17	4.00	37	8.00	75	15.0	32	7.00	45	9.00	99	20.00	100	21.00	20	4.00	-	-	6,500

Table 77

INCOME IN 1969 OF FAMILIES AND PRIMARY INDIVIDUALS IN OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD OF SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH SURNAME

ITEM	Total	Less than $2,000	%	$2,000 to $2,999	%	$3,000 to $3,999	%	$4,000 to $4,999	%	$5,000 to $5,999	%	$6,000 to $6,999	%	$7,000 to $9,999	%	$10,000 to $14,999	%	$15,000 to $24,999	%	$25,000 or more	%	Median (Dollars)
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income:																						
[1]Specified renter occupied	19,899	2,624	13.0	1,151	6.0	1,687	8.0	1,830	4.0	2,165	11.0	1,935	10.0	4,372	22.0	3,003	15.0	913	5.0	239	1.0	6,300
Less than 15 percent	7,212	14	.2	21	.3	122	2.0	184	2.3	526	7.0	586	8.0	2,550	35.0	2,146	30.0	855	12.0	208	3.0	9,500
15 to 19 percent	3,818	49	1.0	54	1.0	181	5.0	510	13.0	678	18.0	622	16.0	1,037	27.0	636	17.0	36	.9	15	.3	6,700
20 to 24 percent	2,350	26	1.0	90	4.0	339	14.0	500	21.0	431	18.0	423	18.0	415	18.0	112	5.0	7	.3	7	.3	5,500
25 to 34 percent	2,349	138	6.0	220	9.0	710	30.0	399	17.0	390	17.0	222	9.0	230	10.0	40	2.0	-	-	-	-	4,300
35 percent or more	3,325	1,919	58.0	722	22.0	323	9.0	201	6.0	77	2.0	42	1.0	18	1.0	23	1.0	-	-	-	-	2,000
Not computed	845	478	57.0	44	5.0	12	1.0	36	4.3	43	5.0	40	5.0	122	14.0	46	5.0	15	2.0	9	1.0	2,000
Selected Characteristics:																						
With air conditioning	9,946	872	9.0	410	4.0	582	6.0	729	7.0	816	8.0	1,036	10.0	2,415	24.0	2,231	22.0	652	7.0	203	2.0	7,700
Room unit(s)	6,657	632	10.0	291	4.0	423	6.0	566	8.0	550	8.0	737	11.0	1,811	27.0	289	19.0	311	5.0	87	1.0	1,200
Central system	3,289	240	7.0	119	4.0	159	5.0	163	5.0	266	8.0	299	9.0	604	18.0	942	29.0	341	10.0	156	5.0	9,000
Automobiles available																						
One	11,486	1,081	9.0	553	5.0	896	8.0	1,142	10.0	394	12.0	1,307	11.0	2,987	25.0	1,666	15.0	434	4.0	186	1.0	6,500
Two	3,586	206	6.0	75	2.0	120	3.0	131	3.0	286	8.0	341	9.0	882	25.0	1,070	30.0	382	11.0	93	3.0	9,200
3 or more	594	64	11.0	26	4.0	31	5.0	52	9.0	43	7.0	44	7.0	113	19.0	125	21.0	65	11.0	31	5.0	8,000
Owner Occupied Housing Units	16,138	966		456		578		687		1,017		1,038		3,935		4,513		2,348		600		9,500

---

[1] Excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more

Table 78

GROSS RENT OF RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS: 1970

ITEM	Total	%	Less than $50	%	$50 to $59	%	$60 to $69	%	$70 to $79	%	$80 to $99	%	$100 to $119	%	$120 to $149	%	$150 to $199	%	$200 to $299	%	$300 or More	%	No Cash Rent	%	Median (Dollars)
Specified Renter Occupied:	238,447	5.0	10,977	4.0	9,526	1.0	16,000	9.0	18,643	17.0	39,956	14.0	34,500	20.0	47,639	15.0	35,314	5.00	12,961	1.00	2,611	4.0	9,232	5.00	111
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income:																									
Less than 10 percent	20,382	13.0	2,593	8.0	1,747	13.0	2,621	12.0	12,424	18.0	3,669	12.0	2,458	10.0	2,217	8.0	1,580	3.00	714	2.00	359	-	....	.50	84
10 to 14 percent	47,332	3.0	1,655	4.0	1,842	7.0	3,476	9.0	4,369	21.0	10,157	17.0	7,952	20.0	9,545	13.0	6,065	4.00	1,838	1.00	433	-	....	.50	105
15 to 19 percent	44,930	3.0	1,191	3.0	1,150	5.0	2,334	6.0	3,078	17.0	7,664	16.0	7,269	23.0	10,469	19.0	8,623	6.00	2,739	1.00	413	-	....	.50	119
20 to 24 percent	30,602	3.0	977	3.0	969	4.0	1,398	6.0	1,813	14.0	4,421	16.0	4,856	25.0	7,672	20.0	6,123	7.00	2,201	1.00	370	-	....	.50	124
24 to 34 percent	31,921	5.0	1,476	3.0	998	5.0	1,703	7.0	2,130	15.0	4,959	14.0	4,786	24.0	7,608	18.0	5,741	7.00	2,154	1.00	368	-	....	.50	120
35 or more percent	49,849	5.0	2,719	5.0	2,662	8.0	3,983	9.0	4,378	17.0	8,382	13.0	6,720	19.0	9,475	16.0	7,786	6.00	3,111	1.00	633	-	....	.50	108
Not computed	13,431	3.0	366	3.0	360	4.0	485	3.0	451	5.0	704	4.0	545	5.0	653	3.0	396	1.00	204	.26	35	68.0	9,232	1.00	92
Air conditioning:																									
Room unit(s)	81,527	2.0	1,754	2.0	1,937	5.0	4,372	8.0	6,782	22.0	18,155	23.0	19,065	20.0	16,120	9.0	7,538	2.00	1,597	.20	142	5.0	4,867	.13	106
Central system	80,262	.4	292	.2	161	.3	255	.5	444	2.0	1,593	8.0	6,739	34.0	27,529	35.0	27,909	14.00	10,961	3.00	2,435	2.0	1,904	.19	154
None	76,629	12.0	8,961	10.0	7,473	15.0	11,289	15.0	11,498	26.0	19,911	11.0	8,669	5.0	3,912	1.0	1,170	.23	181	.06	48	4.0	3,517	.10	78

Table 79

GROSS RENT OF RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH NEGRO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD: 1970

ITEM	Total	Less than $50	%	$50 to $59	%	$60 to $69	%	$70 to $79	%	$80 to $99	%	$100 to $119	%	$120 to $149	%	$150 to $199	%	$200 to $299	%	$300 or more	%	No Cash Rent	%	Median (Dollars)
Specified Renter Occupied[1]	48,110	3,466		3,488		5,748		7,388		3,262		7,304		4,063		1,282		147		20		1,242		85
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income:																								
Less than 10 percent	2,964	455	15.0	309	11.00	553	19.0	565	19.0	674	23.0	260	8.0	91	4.0	11	.37	6	.20	-		...		72
10 to 14 percent	7,678	502	7.0	570	7.00	980	13.0	1,402	18.0	2,491	32.0	1,095	14.0	546	7.0	86	1.00	6	.07	-		...		83
15 to 19 percent	7,469	380	5.0	428	6.00	747	10.0	1,170	15.0	2,462	33.0	1,361	18.0	789	11.0	127	1.00	15	.20	-		...		88
20 to 24 percent	5,495	401	7.0	277	5.00	579	11.0	732	13.0	1,621	29.0	988	18.0	710	13.0	177	3.00	10	.18	-		...		90
25 to 34 percent	7,247	458	6.0	444	6.00	778	11.0	1,092	15.0	1,940	26.0	1,316	18.0	922	13.0	273	4.00	18	.24	6	.08	...		88
35 percent or more	14,550	1,134	8.0	1,235	8.00	1,863	13.0	2,164	15.0	3,761	26.0	2,117	15.0	1,669	11.0	986	3.00	86	.58	14	.09	...		84
Not computed	2,707	136	5.0	185	7.00	244	9.0	261	10.0	313	11.0	177	6.0	116	4.0	22	.81	7	.25	-		1,242	46.0	76
Air Conditioning:																								
Room unit(s)	12,415	323	3.0	377	3.00	939	8.0	1,467	11.0	3,447	28.0	2,945	24.0	1,962	16.0	529	4.00	44	.35	-		382	3.0	97
Central system	3,680	93	3.0	14	.38	94	3.0	150	4.0	377	10.0	884	24.0	1,636	43.0	296	8.00	48	1.00	9	.24	90	2.0	123
None	32,118	2,962	9.0	3,168	10.00	4,820	13.0	5,770	18.0	9,369	29.0	3,528	11.0	1,263	4.0	387	1.00	68	.21	19	.06	764	2.0	78

---

[1] Excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more.

Table 80

GROSS RENT OF RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD OF SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH SURNAME

ITEM	Total	Less than $50	%	$50 to $59	%	$60 to $69	%	$70 to $79	%	$80 to $99	%	$100 to $119	%	$120 to $149	%	$150 to $199	%	$200 to $299	%	$300 or more	%	No Cash Rent	%	Median (Dollars)
Specified Renter Occupied[1]	19,899	1,517		1,200		2,578		2,501		4,417		2,644		2,465		1,646		363		126		642		88
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income																								
Less than 10 percent	2,461	388	15.0	284	12.0	529	22.0	337	14.0	539	22.0	188	8.0	84	3.0	66	3.0	22	.5	24	.5	-	-	71
10 to 14 percent	4,751	319	6.0	331	7.0	734	16.0	715	15.0	1,168	25.0	602	13.0	546	12.0	280	6.0	34	1.0	22	1.0	-	-	84
15 to 19 percent	3,818	194	5.0	175	5.0	437	11.0	444	12.0	1,002	26.0	570	14.0	500	13.0	414	11.0	60	2.0	22	.5	-	-	91
20 to 24 percent	2,350	89	4.0	89	4.0	217	9.0	301	13.0	471	20.0	504	21.0	391	17.0	207	8.0	67	3.0	14	.5	-	-	100
25 to 34 percent	2,349	144	6.0	50	2.0	154	7.0	199	9.0	631	27.0	328	14.0	429	18.0	331	14.0	83	3.0	-	-	-	-	100
35 percent or more	3,325	322	9.0	216	6.0	433	13.0	447	13.0	537	16.0	421	13.0	467	14.0	341	10.0	97	3.0	44	1.0	-	-	87
Not computed	845	61	7.0	55	6.0	74	9.0	58	7.0	69	8.0	31	4.0	48	6.0	7	.0	-	-	-	-	642	52	72
Air Conditioning:																								
Room unit(s)	6,585	165	2.0	186	3.0	497	8.0	766	11.0	1,830	28.0	1,589	24.0	892	13.0	431	7.0	60	1.0	-	-	169	3	97
Central system	3,233	15	.4	-	-	23	1.0	6	.2	76	2.0	230	7.0	1,247	39.0	1,166	36.0	303	9.0	126	4.0	41	1	150
None	10,081	337	13.0	1,014	10.0	2,058	20.0	729	17.0	2,511	25.0	825	8.0	326	3.0	89	1.0	-	-	-	-	232	2	73

---

[1] Excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more

Table 81

PERSONS IN OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD OF SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH SURNAME: 1970

ITEM	Total	1 Person	%	2 Persons	%	3 Persons	%	4 Persons	%	5 Persons	%	6 Persons	%	7 Persons	%	8 Persons or More	%	Median
Owner Occupied Housing Units	16,138	746	5	2,542		2,693		3,113		2,404		1,897		1,438		1,305		4.2
Household Composition:																		
Two-or-more person households:	15,392	...	0	2,542	17	2,693	17	3,113	20	2,404	16	1,897	12	1,438	9	1,305	8	4.3
Male head, wife present, no nonrelatives:	13,574	...	-	2,040	15	2,195	16	2,827	21	2,178	16	1,773	13	1,350	10	1,211	9	4.4
Under 25 years	488	...	-	103	21	165	34	125	26	41	8	33	6	14	3	7	1	3.4
25 to 34 years	3,262	...	-	272	8	550	17	867	27	662	20	358	11	336	10	217	7	4.4
35 to 44 years	4,536	...	-	289	6	374	8	847	19	870	19	912	20	622	14	622	14	5.4
45 to 64 years	4,379	...	-	913	21	895	20	891	20	569	13	433	10	333	7	345	8	3.9
65 years and over	909	...	-	463	51	211	23	[illegible]	11	36	4	37	4	45	5	20	2	2.5
Other male head:	643	...	-	188	[illegible]	138	21	105	16	108	17	25	4	33	5	46	7	3.5
Under 65 years	523	...	-	122	23	110	21	86	16	108	21	25	5	27	5	46	9	3.8
65 years and over	120	...	-	66	55	28	23	20	16	-	-	-	-	6	5	-	0	2.4
Female head:	1,175	...	-	314	27	360	31	181	15	118	10	99	8	55	5	48	4	3.3
Under 65 years	989	...	-	213	22	341	34	163	16	92	9	88	9	44	4	48	5	3.3
65 years and over	186	...	-	101	54	19	10	18	9	26	-	11	13	11	13	-	-	2.4
One-person households	746	746	100	...	-	...	-	...	-	...	-	...	-	...	-	...	-	1.0
Value-Income Ratio:																		
Specified owner occupied[1]	15,095	632	4	2,289	15	2,517	17	2,941	19	2,294	15	1,847	12	1,375	9	1,200	8	4.2
Less than 1.5	9,084	104	1	1,000	11	1,456	16	1,846	20	1,544	17	1,272	14	1,008	11	854	9	4.6
1.5 to 1.9	2,418	67	3	389	16	435	18	542	22	373	15	226	9	207	9	179	7	4.1
2.0 to 2.4	1,120	48	4	244	22	226	20	249	22	136	12	135	12	34	3	49	4	3.7
2.5 to 2.9	626	18	3	146	23	125	20	98	16	119	19	63	10	27	4	30	5	3.7
3.0 to 3.9	697	71	10	243	35	118	17	93	13	52	8	49	7	43	6	23	3	2.8
4.0 or more	1,020	279	27	258	25	125	12	106	10	63	6	88	9	49	5	52	5	2.4
Not computed	135	45	33	9	7	32	24	7	5	8	6	14	10	7	5	13	10	2.9
Renter Occupied Housing Units	20,147	2,513		4,211		4,199		3,074		2,314		1,519		1,423		894		3.3

---

[1] Limited to one-family homes on less than 10 acres and no business on property

Table 82

PERSONS IN OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD OF SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH SURNAME: 1970

ITEM	Total	1 Person	%	2 Persons	%	3 Persons	%	4 Persons	%	5 Persons	%	6 Persons	%	7 Persons	%	8 Persons or More	%	Median
Household Composition:																		
Two-or-more person households:	17,634	...	-	4,211	24	4,199	24	3,074	17	2,314	13	1,519	9	1,423	8	894	5.0	3.6
Male head, wife present, no nonrelatives:	14,068	...	-	2,939	21	3,403	24	2,522	18	1,975	14	1,268	9	1,221	9	740	5.0	3.8
Under 25 years	3,284	...	-	1,015	31	1,319	40	565	17	232	7	63	2	81	2	14	.4	3.0
25 to 34 years	5,436	...	-	920	17	1,265	23	1,182	22	995	18	545	10	386	7	143	3.0	4.0
35 to 44 years	2,664	...	-	285	11	246	9	442	17	414	16	326	12	533	20	418	16.0	6.4
45 to 64 years	2,286	...	-	572	25	477	21	282	12	312	14	293	13	192	8	158	7.0	3.8
65 years and over	398	...	-	147	37	96	24	56	14	22	5	41	10	29	7	7	2.0	3.0
Other male head:	1,267	...	-	529	42	353	28	220	17	86	7	28	2	39	3	12	1.0	2.8
Under 65 years	1,191	...	-	488	41	328	28	220	18	86	7	18	1	39	3	12	1.0	2.8
65 years and over	76	...	-	41	54	25	33	-	-	-	-	10	13	-	-	-	-	...
Female head:	2,299	...	-	743	32	443	19	332	14	253	11	223	10	163	7	142	6.0	3.4
Under 65 years	2,175	...	-	676	31	433	20	299	14	246	11	216	10	163	7	142	6.0	3.5
65 years and over	124	...	-	67	54	10	8	33	26	7	6	7	6	-	0	-	0	2.4
One-person household	2,513	2,513	100	...	-	...	-	...	-	...	-	...	-	...	-	...	-	1.0
Gross Rent as Percentage of Income:																		
Specified Renter Occupied[2]	19,899	2,482	12	4,137	21	4,163	21	3,029	15	2,307	12	1,486	7	1,402	7	894	4.0	3.3
Less than 10 percent	2,461	154	6	506	21	461	19	378	15	353	14	203	8	233	9	173	7.0	3.8
10 to 14 percent	4,751	345	7	877	19	926	20	875	18	585	12	444	9	450	9	249	5.0	3.8
15 to 19 percent	3,818	346	9	725	19	1,023	27	502	13	482	13	298	8	295	8	147	3.0	3.3
20 to 24 percent	2,350	215	9	502	21	465	20	423	18	300	13	167	7	122	5	156	7.0	3.5
25 to 34 percent	2,349	397	17	527	22	500	21	336	14	231	10	133	6	168	7	57	2.0	3.0
35 percent, or more	3,325	800	24	803	24	687	21	383	12	282	8	194	6	95	3	81	2.0	2.6
Not computed	845	225	27	197	23	101	12	132	16	74	9	46	5	39	4	31	4.0	2.5

---

[2] Excludes one-family homes on 10 acres or more

Table 83

PERSONS IN OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH HOUSEHOLD HEAD OF SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH SURNAME: 1970

ITEM	Total	1 Person	%	2 Persons	%	3 Persons	%	4 Persons	%	5 Persons	%	6 Persons	%	7 Persons	%	8 Persons or More	%	Median
Year Structure Built:																		
1969 to March 1970	622	94	15	280	45	96	15	74	12	32	5	39	6	7	1	-	-	2.3
1965 to 1968	1,524	258	17	586	39	368	24	205	13	61	4	26	2	20	1	-	-	2.4
1960 to 1964	1,926	245	13	519	27	452	24	316	16	203	10	110	6	42	2	39	2	2.9
1950 to 1959	4,360	541	12	891	20	931	21	692	16	449	10	324	7	344	8	188	4	3.3
1940 to 1949	5,480	574	11	897	16	1,275	23	908	17	735	13	403	7	425	8	263	5	3.5
1939 or earlier	6,235	801	13	1,038	17	1,077	17	879	14	834	13	617	10	585	9	404	6	3.7
Units in Structure:																		
One	10,924	791	7	1,702	15	2,074	19	1,813	17	1,515	14	1,168	11	1,130	10	731	7	4.0
Two	2,369	260	11	480	20	545	23	391	17	298	12	193	8	116	5	86	4	3.3
3 and 4	1,689	254	15	464	27	400	24	250	15	191	11	53	3	58	3	19	1	2.8
5 to 9	1,008	221	22	262	26	231	23	124	12	92	9	29	3	34	3	15	1	2.6
10 to 19	1,255	332	26	300	24	320	25	178	14	63	5	25	2	23	2	14	1	2.5
20 or more	2,857	655	23	997	35	615	21	311	11	156	5	51	2	53	2	20	1	2.3
Mobile home or trailer	45	-	-	6	13	14	31	7	15	-	-	-	-	9	20	9	20	-
Complete Bathrooms:																		
1 and 1 ½	18,361	2,200	12	3,853	21	3,909	21	2,800	15	2,138	12	1,391	7	1,317	7	753	4	3.3
2 or more	979	73	7	232	24	206	21	184	19	69	7	82	8	49	5	84	8	3.4
None or also used by another household	807	240	30	126	16	84	10	90	11	107	13	46	6	57	7	57	7	2.9

FOOTNOTES

[1] U. S. Department of Labor, "The Social and Economic Status of Negroes in the United States," BLS Report No. 394, Bureau of Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, 1970, pp. 87-93.

[2] Michael A. Stegman, "The New Mythology of Housing," in Hadden, *et al.*, *Metropolis in Crisis* (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., (1971)), pp. 267-75.

[3] John Mixon, Tom F. Lord, and M. Winston Martin, *Housing Issues in Texas* (Arlington, Texas: Texas Urban Development Commission Report, (1971)), pp. 48-56.

[4] *Comprehensive Plan Third Action Year*, Model Cities Department, City of Houston (October, 1972); and *Community Development Statement For the City of Houston, Texas* (March 15, 1973).

[5] Annie Harris, *Housing Code Enforcement and the Black Community*, (Houston, Texas: Publication of the Urban Resources Center in Texas Southern University, (1973)).

[6] For an examination of the housing situation in the United States, with reference to individual cities, see: Whitney M. Young, Jr., *Decent Housing: Whose Responsibility?* (A Publication of the National Urban League, New York City).

CHAPTER 4

HEALTH CARE AND THE BLACK POPULATION

Few issues in recent years have stirred more impassioned debate than the subject of health care. Proposals for compulsory health insurance and the establishment of a national health program represent responses to the concern for health services in the nation.

A recent article, "The Economics of Health Care," discusses the spiraling medical costs and the uneven quality and distribution of health services in this country. "Last year," the article reports, "close to $80 billion -- up from $76 billion in the previous year -- was spent on health care nationally, making it the third largest industry in the United States. Still, an estimated 40 million Americans, most of them poor -- receive less than adequate medical attention."[1]

The concern over medical costs and health services is not just limited to poor people or the nation's minorities. Middle America also faces the financial burden of mushrooming prices for health service delivery. Over 80 percent of this group carries some type of voluntary health insurance, yet few can afford or sustain the burden of prolonged illness by virtue of rising prices for hospital and medical care. In 1970, it was reported that the average cost of hospitalization per day was about $70. In larger cities such as New York and Boston, the cost was much higher, ranging from a high of $110 in New York to a high of $103 in Boston. It is estimated by some experts that by 1973 the national average will approximate at least $98 per day.

Despite the fact that America spends more per capita for health care than other countries, the nation's poor, black and other minorities, and the middle class experience grave difficulty in receiving and paying for health care.

Rural families suffer from a lack of adequate health care even more. Caught in a cycle of poverty and some ignorance, the rural poor suffer from malnutrition, sickle cell anemia, heart and lung disease, and many other unattended ills. Studies have also shown that "in cities where hospital clinics have largely replaced the family physician, poor people usually have to wait long hours for treatment."[2] A survey of the health care of the poor and of minorities in Houston by the Urban Resources Center in Texas Southern University indicates that this same condition exists in Houston.

A great deal of the inadequacies concerning health care and treatment in Houston are attributable to the limited supply of black physicians in the nation. Only two percent of the nation's estimated 332,000 physicians are black, and although some attempts have been made to increase the number of blacks entering the medical profession, progress has been relatively slow. However, some changes in enrollment have been noted.

An analysis of black enrollment in all medical schools, including students from Houston, shows a constant numerical figure of 220 up until 1971-72. Through special public and private grants, the enrollment for black medical students in the nation as a whole climbed to 881 in 1971-72. This is a drastic change in enrollment patterns when measured from the standpoint of previous years.

Prior to 1967, over 80 percent of the black physicians in America were trained in two predominantly black medical institutions, despite the fact that most medical schools in the country were receiving federal aid. Since 1967, however, predominantly white medical schools have now begun to accept blacks and other minorities in their programs.

HEALTH NEEDS OF HOUSTON'S MINORITIES

Through interviews with a sample of black physicians, it was discovered that most felt that Houston needs a better delivery system of health care for minority communities. An upgraded health delivery system would necessarily require more physicians, -- particularly blacks. It is estimated that there are 6,000 physicians in the city; of this number, 70 or 1.2 percent are black.

Fifty (50) of the seventy black physicians practice in the Model Cities designated neighborhoods. The city-wide proportionate rate of black physicians per service population is estimated at one per 4,500 persons.

Black families in Kashmere Gardens and Trinity Gardens, until recently, had to rely on the services of one pediatrician. Other minority areas experience similar difficulty in receiving adequate forms of medical care. Many of the black physicians indicated that an increase in other medical personnel such as nurses, respiratory therapists, and medical technicians, at all levels, will assist in improving health conditions for the poor. Obtaining and servicing more mobile health units and ordinary clinics would also help.

COST

The cost of medical care hinders low income and middle class Americans alike, but the former suffers even more. As previously stated, an average hospital day, nationally costs $70; in New York and Boston the cost is $110 and $103, respectively. In Houston, it was difficult to pinpoint a "single figure" average cost because prices vary according to the kind of service received. A survey of hospital insurance agencies, however, showed semi-private rooms ranging from around $34 to $55; lower figures generally apply to the Harris County Hospital District. As a whole, average costs per room (not including other services), range from a low cost of $33 to a high cost of $42, depending on the hospital and the facilities available. Drugs and physician's fees were difficult to pinpoint from the data collected.

In 1971, it was reported that about 220 federal departments and agencies administered some form of health programs. It should be noted that the recent proposed cutbacks by the Nixon Administration will greatly reduce the health benefits provided by previous administrations. During the Johnson years, Congress authorized an estimated 51 statutes of health legislation that were to be administered by various authorities. There is some evidence to indicate that steps were not taken to provide the coordinated and comprehensive efforts necessary to insure maximum benifits to the general citizenry. Medicare and Medicaid, though well conceived, did not turn out to be the panacea for the health ills of the poor, the aged, and black populations. In failing to provide for these elements through a comprehensive health delivery system, federal efforts tended to provide impetus to an increase in health cost. To be sure, blacks from urban and rural areas, and other minorities, such as Chicanos, poor whites, and Indians, have had to cope daily with the reality of inadequate health care.

HOSPITAL CARE

The "separate-but-equal" doctrine which permeated the whole of American life for many years insured the survival of parallel racial institutions. These institutional paradigms limited black participation in public and private hospitals administered by the white sector. The larger white hospitals which admitted blacks required that they demonstrate an unquestioned ability to pay in advance. The patients who were admitted were housed in separate wings of hospitals. In many rural areas of the South, this practice of de facto segregation in hospitals still exists. Much of this segregation, however, is due to the timidity of minority patients who continually conform to older established customs.

Hospitals which evolved during earlier periods still serve predominantly black populations. Homer G. Phillips in St. Louis; George Hubbard in Nashville; Riverside General Hospital, Mercy, Lockwood and St. Elizabeth hospitals in Houston; Provident Hospital in Baltimore; Flint-Goodrich in New Orleans; and Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, D. C. are a few of the black hospitals which have survived despite insufficient funding.

Black hospitals in Houston operate, for the most part, with insufficient funding for staff, equipment, and on-going biomedical research. Research on sickle cell anemia, a disease which affects blacks more than other groups, has been largely carried on in white medical research units, according to a National Institute of Mental Health official, because few black hospitals have funds to engage in large-scale and continuing medical research projects.

To be sure, the black communities of Houston and in the nation (as well as the hospitals which serve them) are encountering health care problems similar to those of the nation's middle classes and the poor. In the case of minorities, the problems are more acute. This is clearly reflected in several vital areas:

> Nonwhite babies in the nation die at a rate nearly double that of white Americans. In Houston, the rate of infant deaths is higher for the black population than for the white population in all data for the decade, 1961-1971. Each group experienced a decrease in infant deaths; however, as shown in Table 84, black infants died at a rate of 36.62 per 1,000 live births in 1961; the white infant death rate was 22.33 for the same period. By 1971, the black infant death rate had decreased to 26.90 per 1,000 live births, while the white infant mortality rate had decreased to 17.78 per 1,000 live births.
>
> The chief cause of infant deaths is ill-defined diseases. The second cause of deaths is postnatal asphyxia. Table 85 gives an infant summary of deaths by race and sex during 1971 in Houston. More male whites die of infections at birth than blacks; more female black babies die of infections at birth than white female babies. On the whole more white babies die of congenital malformation circulatory system disease than black babies.
>
> The maternal death rate for nonwhite American mothers is four times that of white American mothers. As a whole, American mothers die in childbirth at a rate higher than that of eleven (11) other countries.

Table 84

INFANT DEATHS BY RACE AND SEX HOUSTON RESIDENCE 1961-1971
(Rate Per 1,000 Live Births)

YEAR	WHITE				NEGRO				TOTAL			
	Male	Female	Total	Rate	Male	Female	Total	Rate	Male	Female	Total	Rate
1961	208	164	372	22.33	142	133	275	36.62	350	297	647	26.77
1962	217	157	374	22.17	156	120	276	36.11	373	277	650	26.52
1963	195	154	349	20.84	144	104	248	32.17	339	258	597	24.41
1964	211	147	358	21.78	178	140	318	41.01	389	287	676	27.94
1965	193	145	338	22.26	141	101	242	32.09	334	246	580	25.53
1966	183	144	327	21.20	147	126	273	37.21	330	270	600	26.36
1967	169	117	286	18.73	124	87	211	29.36	293	204	497	22.13
1968	178	135	313	20.19	130	95	225	32.90	308	230	538	24.08
1969	175	113	288	17.46	119	104	223	30.17	294	217	511	21.40
1970	181	141	322	18.98	131	75	206	25.16	312	216	528	20.99
1971	172	119	291	17.78	129	102	231	26.90	301	221	522	20.92

Table 85

INFANT SUMMARY OF DEATH
HOUSTON RESIDENCE
1971

SUMMARY CAUSE OF DEATH	WHITE		NEGRO		TOTAL		TOTAL
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Septicaemia Pyaemia	1				1		1
Avitaminosis			1		1		1
Allergic Disorders							
Mental Deficiency			2		2		2
Vascular Lesions							
Non Meningoc Meningitis	5	1	1	1	6	2	8
Otitis Media Mastoiditis			1		1		1
Dis. Circulatory Sys.			1		1		1
Lobar Pneumonia							
Bronchopneumonia	2	1			2	1	3
Primary Atyp. & Unspec. Pneu.	13	9	15	11	28	20	48
Chronic Bronchitis	1				1		1
All Other Resp. Diseases	1	1	4		5	1	6
Gastroenteritis Colitis	1		1		2		2
Cirrhosis of Liver	1				1		1
Other Dis. Digest Sys.	1			2	1	2	3
Dis. Genito Urinary Sys.			1		1		1
Other Diseases Skin							
Spina Bifida	3	3			3	3	6
Congen. Malform. Cir. Sys.	14	16	3	3	17	19	36
Other Congen. Malform.	13	8	7	8	20	16	36
Birth Injuries	8	10	14	5	22	15	37
Postnatal Asphyxia	32	19	26	21	58	40	98
Infections of Newborn	12	3	9	7	21	10	31
Haemolytic Dis. Newborn	2	3		2	2	5	7
Dis. Early Infancy	3	1	1	4	4	5	9
Ill Defined Diseases Inf.	52	41	39	33	91	74	165
Ill Defined Causes	2				2		2
Motor Vehicle Accidents	2			1	2	1	3
Accident Fire Explosion		1		1		2	2
Accident Drowning		1				1	1
All Other Accidents	3	1	3	2	6	3	9
Homicide				1		1	1
Total	172	119	129	102	301	221	522

Table 86

DEATHS BY RACE AND SEX HOUSTON RESIDENCE 1960-1971
(Rate Per 1,000 Population)

YEAR	WHITE				NEGRO				TOTAL			
	Male	Female	Total	Rate	Male	Female	Total	Rate	Male	Female	Total	Rate
1960	2,742	1,874	4,616	6.38	1,009	804	1,813	8.43	3,751	2,678	6,429	6.85
1961	2,612	1,925	4,537	6.16	961	814	1,775	8.06	3,573	2,739	6,312	6.60
1962	2,719	1,983	4,702	6.21	1,012	929	1,941	8.58	3,731	2,912	6,643	6.75
1963	2,937	2,154	5,091	6.53	1,090	885	1,975	8.49	4,027	3,039	7,066	6.98
1964	3,028	2,086	5,114	6.39	1,138	891	2,029	8.48	4,166	2,977	7,143	6.87
1965	3,056	2,160	5,216	6.34	1,136	950	2,086	8.48	4,192	3,110	7,302	6.83
1966	3,089	2,299	5,388	6.37	1,207	927	2,134	8.44	4,296	3,226	7,522	6.84
1967	3,228	2,217	5,445	6.26	1,213	892	2,105	8.11	4,441	3,109	7,550	6.69
1968	3,352	2,418	5,770	6.47	1,263	1,014	2,277	8.54	4,615	3,432	8,047	6.64
1969	3,496	2,501	5,997	6.55	1,439	1,049	2,488	9.10	4,935	3,550	8,485	6.94
1970	3,476	2,617	6,093	6.65	1,394	1,022	2,416	7.63	4,870	3,639	8,509	6.90
1971	3,476	2,603	6,079	6.52	1,396	1,101	2,497	7.75	4,872	3,704	8,576	6.83

> Most deaths occur from heart disease than other illnesses. Tuberculosis took the life of less people in 1971 than any other cause in Houston, with cancer, strokes, and accidents following in that order.
>
> Tables 88 and 89 give data on births by race and sex, illegitimacy by race and sex.

Included also in this section is information on hospitals in Houston and on major concerns by blacks about specific health experiments by established authorities which tend to support rumors on "planned genocide" and related items.

IMPROVEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In a report to the Surgeon General of Public Health Service, the Advisory Committee on Urban Health Affairs acknowledged that "in today's world of tightly interlocking problems, virtually every agency's mission has relevancy to health." Public health leadership, the report said, "has a clear and continuing responsibility to mobilize effective action of health across the entire range of human activity."[3] We accept this statement unquestioningly, but unfortunately neither federal, public, nor private leadership has been able to effectively coordinate health services to insure the adequate delivery of services to all groups, especially the middle class, the aged, poor and black populations. The needs of these groups are multi-faceted in character.

Table 87

FREQUENCY OF SELECTED STATISTICS
HOUSTON RESIDENCE 1971
(Total Population)

CAUSE OF DEATH	ONE PERSON DIES EVERY ---			TOTAL
	Hours	Minutes	Seconds	
Heart Disease	3	4	56	2,842
Cancer	5	16	3	1,663
Stroke	8	59	4	975
Accidents	19	5	6	459
Diseases of Early Infancy	25	14	42	347
Homicides	28	10	1	311
Cirrhosis of Liver	43	21	58	202
Pneumonia	44	1	12	199
Suicides	49	46	21	176
Diabetes Mellitus	59	11	39	148
Congentl.Malformations	81	6	39	108
General Arteriosclerosis	81	52	9	107
Nephritis	125	8	34	70
Hypertension Without Heart Disease	194	40	34	45
Tuberculosis	230	31	34	38
All Other Causes	8	3	5	1,088
TOTAL DEATHS	1	1	17	8,576
TOTAL INFANT DEATHS	16	46	53	522
TOTAL BIRTHS		21	3	24,958
TOTAL ILLEGITIMATE	2	10	35	4,025
SETS OF TWINS	36	30		240

Table 88

BIRTHS BY RACE HOUSTON, TEXAS
(Rate Per 1,000 Population)

YEAR	WHITE				NEGRO				TOTAL			
	Male	Female	Total	Rate	Male	Female	Total	Rate	Male	Female	Total	Rate
1963	10,489	10,090	20,579	26.41	4,375	4,172	8,547	36.72	14,864	14,262	29,126	28.78
1964	10,512	10,097	20,609	25.74	4,370	4,223	8,593	35.92	14,882	14,320	29,202	28.08
1965	9,932	9,262	19,194	23.32	4,225	4,146	8,371	34.05	14,157	13,408	27,565	25.79
1966	9,915	9,609	19,524	23.07	4,163	3,961	8,124	32.14	14,078	13,570	27,648	25.16
1967	10,102	9,595	19,697	22.66	4,086	3,924	8,010	30.85	14,188	13,519	27,707	24.54
1968	10,645	10,131	20,776	23.28	3,769	3,802	7,571	28.40	14,414	13,933	28,347	24.46
1969	11,777	11,304	23,081	25.21	4,080	4,088	8,168	29.87	15,857	15,392	31,249	26.28
1970	12,606	11,812	24,418	26.65	4,680	4,456	9,136	28.86	17,286	16,268	33,554	27.22
1971	12,451	11,822	24,273	26.02	4,889	4,694	9,583	29.73	17,340	16,516	33,856	26.98

Table 89

ILLEGITIMATES BY RACE AND SEX HOUSTON RESIDENCE 1963-1971

(Rate Per 1,000 Live Births)

YEAR	WHITE				NEGRO				TOTAL			
	Male	Female	Total	Rate	Male	Female	Total	Rate	Male	Female	Total	Rate
1963	279	304	583	34.81	1,014	889	1,903	246.89	1,293	1,193	2,486	101.66
1964	342	335	677	41.19	903	842	1,745	225.02	1,245	1,177	2,422	100.12
1965	437	377	814	53.62	836	882	1,718	227.82	1,273	1,259	2,532	111.43
1966	424	370	794	51.48	963	908	1,871	255.01	1,387	1,278	2,665	117.09
1967	436	398	834	54.63	1,032	970	2,002	278.56	1,468	1,368	2,836	126.30
1968	536	469	1,005	64.82	984	1,010	1,994	291.56	1,520	1,479	2,999	134.22
1969	521	516	1,037	62.88	1,057	1,063	2,120	286.80	1,578	1,579	3,157	132.18
1970	561	542	1,103	65.02	1,271	1,273	2,544	310.66	1,832	1,815	3,647	144.99
1971	562	563	1,125	68.72	1,492	1,408	2,900	337.72	2,054	1,971	4,025	161.27

Interviews with physicians in Houston indicated the need for a decrease in medical costs. It was also suggested that more counseling and dietary instructions be given to minority residents. This suggestion is directed toward lower class groups of all races rather than middle class persons. Studies have shown that many middle and upper middle class blacks are decidedly more well-fed than whites with comparable incomes, thereby destroying the myth that "all blacks are undernourished."

Other black physicians tended to believe that improvements in related conditions such as better housing and environmental conditions would aid in correcting health conditions for many minorities. Better housing conditions and less crowdedness would contribute to a decrease in the incidence of diseases caused by such conditions. Improvements in transportation facilities and outpatient services in clinics and hospitals were also suggested.

Specific improvements in some areas are being made in Houston. A few are listed here.

1. The Health Department is presently acquiring or has already acquired a mobile unit financed under a $300,000 Federal Family Planning Grant.
2. The Health Department is trying to expand its immunization services through an increase in area clinics. For example, an immunization clinic has been opened in the Hufsmith area. New Clinics are being considered in the Acres Homes and Casa de Amigas areas. Ben Taub Hospital has acquired a clinic for children, with its own pharmacy, so that parents with ill children will not have to wait long hours to get medicine.

3. The Texas Board of Mental Health and Retardation has approved $229,000 for assistance to community mental health centers.

4. The City of Houston has acquired a city-owned ambulance service and plans for an emergency room link.

5. There have been improvements in Care Programs, resulting in a decrease in infant and maternal death rates among the poor.

6. The Gulf State Dental Association plans to establish a Dental Service Corporation to help poor people obtain federal funds for comprehensive dental work.

SOME MEDICALLY-RELATED CONCERNS BY THE BLACK POPULATION

Brain Surgery to Control Behavior

According to an article included in Ebony Magazine (February, 1973) the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) agreed to award a $500,000 grant to Dr. William Sweet, Chief of Neurosurgery at Massachusetts General Hospital, to determine if there is any connection between violent behavior and brain disease. More specifically, he was asked to develop a way to identify and control persons who commit "senseless" violence, as well as those "who are constantly in and out of jail." In conjunction with this study, the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), invested $108,930 in further brain research by two of Dr. Sweet's colleagues, Dr. Frank Ervin, a psychiatrist, and Dr. Vernon Mark, Chief of Neurosurgery at Boston City Hospital. The Justice

Department ordered the grantees to "to determine the incidence of brain disorders in a state penitentiary of men; to establish their presence' in a civilian population; and to "improve, develop and test the usefulness" of electrodes and brain surgery "for the detection of such disorders in Boston City Hospital."

Noted black psychologists, including Dr. Alvin Pouissant, associate professor of psychiatry at Harvard University Medical School, have expressed deep concerns about the studies. Known case studies have indicated that the subjects or targets are often blacks. In describing the studies as racist, Pouissant adds rather bluntly, "It assumes that black people are genetically damaged--that they are so animal and so savage that whites have to carve their brains to make them into human beings."

In reference to these medical maneuvers, there is concern because a large proportion of the prison population is black, and prisoners seem to be fair game for the psychosurgeon's knife. Prison officials claim that these operations are performed only with voluntary consent, but critics of the program argue that there is no such thing as "freedom of consent" in a penal institution. To be sure, there is reason to be alarmed about brain surgery to control behavior.

Sickle Cell Anemia

Sickle Cell Anemia is a disease which touches one out of every ten black men and women in the United States. In his message to congress, President Nixon pronounced sickle cell anemia "a targeted disease for concentrated research" and added that his administration would propose a two-fold increase from a previous $6 million to $12 million. It is felt that all Americans and blacks should support the local chapters for sickle cell anemia.

Syphillis: The Tuskegee Study

An experiment which began forty (40) years ago, called the Tuskegee Study, culminated in 1972 when it was discovered that 400 black syphillitics used as subjects in the study were never treated for the disease. The project was a cooperative venture between the Alabama State Health Agencies and the U. S. Public Health Services.

The tragic revelation of the experiment which began in 1932 led to a full scale investigation which caused the Congressional Black Caucus to condemn the study as "a morally indefensible act." Facts about the case indicated that the researchers denied medical treatment to the 400 blacks. These individuals gave their consent without fully understanding the consequences. Pressure is being applied for relief to survivors and offsprings of the victims. HEW officials made it clear that the federal government has no legal means to deliver health care to those who survived the experiment.

All experiments involving human guinea pigs for experimentation should be carefully examined in order to prevent medical abuse against people in general, and blacks in particular. In the Tuskegee Syphillis Study, there is evidence to suggest that this was not the case. Doctors testified before a government-appointed committee that there is no evidence that participants in the controversial Federal Syphillis Study conducted by the U. S. Public Health Service, beginning in 1932, ever gave their informed consent to take part. One of the doctors indicated that he believed the participants had been subjected to undue coercion to cooperate. Four hundred and thirty (430) men, all blacks, were never given treatment for the disease because doctors wanted to study what damage untreated syphillis does to the human body. At least 28, and possibly as many as 107, of the men died as a direct result of untreated syphillis. The refusal of treatment was deliberate to the point of regulation and control by participating nurses in the study.

A University of Texas research team deprived 17 infants of a food substance essential for their development in an experiment conducted in 1956-57. The infants were deprived, for 13 weeks, of a fatty substance, linoleic acid, even though it was known that denial of the substance caused possible damage to the brain or spinal cord in animals. The study was conducted by the County Hospital in Galveston, and its results published in 1959. In this medical experiment, twelve of the children were black and five were white. Information concerning the experiment was contained in an article in the Boston Globe and carried through UPI in the Houston Chronicle, March 24, 1973.

The results of the hearing on medical abuse, with particular reference to the Tuskegee experiment, led to recommendations of the special citizens' panel. In its drafted report, made public March 1, the panel added its voice to the congressional viewpoint and called for the federal government to set up a permanent human experimentation investigation board to curb future abuses of human subjects in medical researches.

The Need For More Black Dentists

There exists a dire need to increase the number of qualified black dentists in Houston and other parts of the country. Black dentists make up two and one half (2½%) percent of the total number of dentists in this country. In Houston, there are 36 members of the Charles A. George Dental Association, a black organization in the city. Of this total, one member practices dentistry in Galveston and two are retired. Only thirty-two black dentists in Houston are active in the organization and provide services to predominately black clients. The bulk of the 316,000 blacks in the city patronize these dentists.

Blacks are highly visible and over-represented at the bottom of the professional ladders in both dental and medical fields. For instance, registered nurses comprise seven percent of the total number of nurses in the nation; practical nurses, 15 percent, but the number of black nurse's aides is more than 50 percent of the total. The shortage of blacks at the top of the profession was explained in part by Dr. James L. Curtis of Cornell Medical College in "The Economics of Health Care," published by Black Enterprise (June, 1972). "The shortage is due largely to the fact that for some time, medical schools in the country were admitting no more than token numbers of blacks,"[4] says Dr. Curtis.

Black Employment Participation in Dental Trades

A survey was conducted during 1970 for the purpose of determining the nature of the job market for black Americans in the dental trades industry. The study, focusing on the social and economic aspects of the industry, sought to determine attitudes of executives toward hiring and promoting employees in general and black employees in particular. This very timely study explored central issues relating to employment; the demands for blacks in dental trade associations and laboratories; and the efforts being made by these insititutions to incorporate occupational experiences of blacks into their companies.

Preliminary findings of the study indicate that black employment in the dental trades is very low, with the greater proportion of those employed working in non-supervisory positions. Some very encouraging trends were found to be hidden in the aggregate data obtained on employment policies and qualifications. Despite the less prominent indication of promotion by some companies, exclusively from within, the employment of blacks in upper level occupational categories appears to be somewhat promising. More complete findings of the survey will be included in A Profile of the Negro in American Dentistry. The volume was compiled by Dr. Foster Kidd of Dallas, Texas, in collaboration with several other dentists throughout the country, and it is scheduled for publication by the Howard University Press later this year. Included in the appendice is a directory of hospitals for Houston and Harris county 1973, indicating where volunteers are needed.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "The Economics of Health Care," Black Enterprise, June, 1972, pp. 17-20.

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

[3] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Securing Health in Our Urban Future," Washington, D.C.: Public Health Service Publication No. 1581, December, 1965, p. iii.

CHAPTER 5

POLITICS AND THE MINORITY VOTER

Prior to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, any attempt at analyzing the extent of black voter participation in any area of American politics involved a journey into an unhappy phase of American constitutional and political morality. Recent developments in the South and the nation, however, suggest that there is increasing political activity among blacks in local, state, and national elections. This emerging political strength relates to the removal of certain restrictions on voter registration in the South. History affords us ample evidence concerning the exclusion of blacks from the political scene. Despite previous denials of the right to vote, there is a growing awareness on the part of blacks of the necessity to adjust to certain rules and norms of the political world. This trend toward political socialization includes, but is not confined to, issues vital to full citizenship. There is evidence that black voters are beginning to concentrate on stronger currents in the political stream -- issues and answers which merit concern of the general public. This shift from the single issue of civil rights to an all-inclusive concern for broader issues marks a turning point in the political aspirations of black Americans.

The advent of single member district legislation made it possible for some blacks to be elected to city, state, and national offices. The districts from which many blacks seek election are predominantly black because of segregation in housing. From such areas in Houston, and other cities, it is relatively easy for black and other minority group members to get elected to public office. However, in districts which cut across racial lines, there is some difficulty experienced by the minority group candidates. In cases where the office-seeker makes an appeal for broad support, it is possible for a candidate to win office only if he can convince voters that his concern on issues is not limited to racial matters. Even where this normally occurs, there is great difficulty in getting elected, particularly if he is opposed by white candidates.

Four black candidates from Harris County won seats to the state legislature with only token general election opposition. The victories increased minority representation in the county's delegation by 50 percent. Two of the newly elected legislators were unopposed in the November election of 1972. Representative Senfronia Thompson of District 89 and Mickey Leland from District 88 were certain of their victories by virtue of no opposition in the general election.

Most of the predominantly black districts correspond, in many ways, to census tract boundaries and cut across predominantly black communities. Districts 85,86, and 87 are considered to be minority areas. Representative Craig A. Washington won election in District 86; Anthony Hall won for District 85;and Mexican-American Representative Ben T. Reyes won in District 87. Reyes, like Thompson and Leland, was unopposed in his District. Outside of the districts which served the minority communities, there is no representation by minority group members in predominantly white districts. It is safe to assume that only in cases where minority group members defeat others of their race can they be expected to get elected to office under the present system. For many years, whites represented districts (through the multi-member system) which had substantial black and brown populations. However, when the situation is reversed, white populations will not support black candidates in their districts nor will they vote for them if one uses previous election statistics as a basis for this fact.

Harris County's ethnic vote is concentrated in a strip of five legislative districts, extending from the South Loop to the extreme northeast corner of Houston. Only in the case of Reyes is there a mixed racial district and this one has a 47 percent Mexican-American population and about 30 percent black with the balance between whites and others. Leland's district consists of an almost solidly black area lying northeast of downtown Houston, with the Kashmere Gardens subdivision at its center. Washington's District 86 lies east of Main Street to Braes Bayou and the area includes Texas Southern University and the University of Houston. In the November 1972 General Election, Washington was opposed by a 21 year-old University of Houston student. The district represented by Mrs. Senfronia Thompson lies in northeast Houston. The area was 51 percent black in 1970, but there is evidence that this area is in transition and the black majority will continue to increase by virtue of white succession.

Black representation in the legislature marks a new stream in Texas politics. The strong ties linking many minority group members together by the psychological bond of race have promoted not only increased political representation, but a greater degree of solidarity among this segment of the electorate. This togetherness embraces a tenuous unity supported by a consciousness of kind and common needs, which cannot be measured in terms of degrees of leadership. Instead, one must view black representation in state government as one step toward obtaining a greater voice in the affairs which directly affect minority communities.

There is also some evidence that minority group members are becoming more active in politics because other measures -- demonstrations, boycotts, etc. -- have failed. There is a widening of interest in public issues also. In Houston, the recent Bond Election received a wide spectrum of support from various levels of the society. In an article carried in the Houston Post (February 25, 1973), it was reported that "in almost every ethnic and economic group, voters who turned out...strongly supported the city's $145 million bond proposal..." Voters in predominantly black precincts were more skeptical about the bond proposals than those from other areas. Black voters were concerned with particular item allocations. This is not uncommon when one considers that black areas in the city have been the most neglected. The middle class black voter is cognizant of the need to have a thorough understanding of the use to which these funds will be put. As a result, several individual proposals in the bond election won more support from the black community than others. Precincts with predominantly Mexican-American voters and the low income white precincts gave less support than the general voting public. Even where support was average, 60 to 65 percent of those voting approved the proposals. Middle income and upper income whites demonstrated greater support through voting than the less affluent whites. Support at these levels approximated about 80 percent approval.

In the past bond election, minority group voters showed a concern for issues which affected the general population. This is essential if one considers the past political activity by these groups. In the past, black participation in bond elections was relatively low. We predict that there will be even greater political activity in Houston among minority segments, particularly in elections on education, mayoral candidates , and county offices. Black politics throughout the country is acquiring a great deal of political sophistication. Campaign organizations, strategies, techniques, and voter registration are being developed by civic and political groups for use by potential black office holders.

On the national scene, former state senator Barbara Jordan of Houston won election to the United States House of Representatives. She became the first black woman from the South to achieve such a distinction. Miss Jordan was among several black newcomers to serve at the national level. Andrew Young of Atlanta, Georgia, became the first black from the deep South to be elected to the House since 1901. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan joined Miss Yvonne Brathwaite in Washington as a member of Congress. In other state and local elections blacks were also winning election to key offices. In Arkansas, Illinois (Bloomington), Minnesota, Oregon, and Alabama blacks made some political gains during the November 1972 general election. Data on blacks in local political office and statistics on voter turnout and voter registration for minority groups in Houston have been included in this report. (See Appendices)

In the Presidential Election of 1972, black voters gave more support to President Richard Nixon than in previous years. The turnout increased from about 6 percent to about 15 percent. In black ghettos, however, Senator George McGovern won 86 percent to 14 percent for Nixon.

Changing conditions over the last several years have somewhat modified civil rights emphases, and persistent integrative efforts are being viewed by the average, less-militant black, in Houston and the nation, as part of a political world which he must discover and utilize. Complete political socialization is the goal of the middle and upper middle class black, young adults and youthful individuals. The gradual learning of norms, attitudes, and behavior of the on-going political system will become the functional equivalent of non-violent protest marches. Two conditions may be responsible for the functioning, induction, and assimilation of blacks into the political culture of the nation. One condition relates to the newly-acquired suffrage brought on by the removal of restrictions on voter registration. The other relates to prior isolation from the majority group. Segregation was long the basis for the belongingness, status, and role attribution of minority group members; it was also the foundation for attendant matters of loyalty, privilege, and responsibility. In such caste status, the scheme of political readiness developed within the framework of a common denominator of needs and expectations in the various phases of his living. Despite progress in civil rights, discrimination still exists in areas of education and employment. With the gradual disappearance of non-violent protests, minority groups -- out of necessity and the search for a new strategy -- had to embrace a new means to achieve the ends of equality. This is more clearly illustrated in mayoral races, such as the ones in Prichard, Alabama, and Oakland, California. In each of these cities, young blacks sought political office. In Oakland, Black Panther Bobby Seale forced his opponent into a runoff in April, 1973.

The second condition stems from the psychological damage which is the result of previous political containment. Black voters will continue to pursue issues pertaining to equality. Candidates seeking black support will have to write in their platforms issues which touch on the general welfare of the group as a whole. To be sure, there are times when the black voter wants to escape the tyranny of his own type by using the concept "human rights", instead of "civil rights." His mental organizational conformity is characteristic of a people struggling to make an "already possessed" patriotic dream a reality. If any candidate prepares a suitable platform, which includes benefits for all people but most certainly minority groups, he can capture the black vote irrespective of party affiliation. The traditional democratic voter strength in Texas and the nation is crumbling to some degree. This gradual shift is concomitant with the emergence of complete political socialization among blacks. Another converging trend toward greater political awareness has been the election of blacks to local, state and national offices. The influence of these political lines of development will give greater impetus to civic and community participation among minority group voters in the years ahead.

Statistics on the civic and community participation of minority groups and other representatives are included for the years, 1971-1973, in Tables 90 through 94.

Table 90
HARRIS COUNTY DELEGATION IN THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Senate

Liberal Democrat (Incumbent)	Chet Brooks	District 11
Liberal Democrat (Incumbent)	James P. (Jim) Wallace	District 6
Liberal Democrat	Bob Gammage	District 7
Liberal Democrat	A. R. (Babe) Schwartz	District 17
Democrat	Jack Ogg	District 15
Right Wing Republican	Walter H. Mengden, Jr.	District 13

House of Representatives

Liberal Democrat	Joe Allen	District 78
Liberal Democrat	Jim Clark	District 99
Liberal Democrat	Woody Denson	District 81
Liberal Democrat	Anthony Hall	District 85
Liberal Democrat	Mickey Leland	District 88
Liberal Democrat	R. C. (Nick) Nichols	District 98
Liberal Democrat	Joe Pentony	District 80
Liberal Democrat	Ben T. Reyes	District 87
Liberal Democrat	Senfronia Thompson	District 89
Liberal Democrat	Craig A. Washington	District 86
Liberal Democrat	Lindon Williams	District 96
Moderate Democrat	R. E. (Gene) Green	District 95
Moderate Democrat	Hawkins Menefee	District 84
Conservative Democrat	John Whitmore	District 82
Democrat	Gene Jones	District 97
Democrat	Ron Waters	District 79
Democrat	Ed R. Watson	District 17
Right Wing Republican	William J. (Bill) Blythe	District 91
Republican	Ray Bailey	District 90
Republican	Ray Barnhardt	District 100
Republican	Sid Bowers	District 92
Republican	Milton E. Fox	District 93
Republican	Don Henderson	District 94
Republican	Larry A. Vick	District 83

Table 91
HARRIS COUNTY HOUSE MEMBERS COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Name and City	Committee Assignment
Joe Allen Baytown	Chairman, House administration; revenue and taxation
Kay Bailey Houston	Elections, intergovernmental affairs; revenue and taxation
Ray Barnhardt Pasadena	Education, elections, insurance
W. J. (Bill) Blythe, Jr. Houston	Vice-chairman insurance; calendars, natural resources
Sid Bowers Houston	Business and industry, labor, environmental affairs
Jim Clark Pasadena	Chairman, labor; education
Woody Denson Houston	Criminal jurisprudence, environmental affairs, judiciary
Milton E. Fox Houston	Intergovernmental relations, natural resources, transportation
Raymond E. (Gene) Green Houston	Insurance, labor, state affairs
Anthony Hall Houston	Appropriations, intergovernmental affairs, labor
Don Henderson Houston	Business and industry, judiciary, reapportionment
Gene Jones Houston	Environmental affairs, judiciary, state affairs
Mickey Leland Houston	Human resources, labor and state affairs
Hawkins Meneffee Houston	Appropriations, calendars, rules
R. C. (Nick) Nichols Houston	Elections, insurance, labor
Joe Pentony Houston	Education, reapportionment

Table 91
HARRIS COUNTY HOUSE MEMBERS COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS (Cont.)

Name and City	Committee Assignment
Ben T. Reyes Houston	Human resources, labor, reapportionment
Senfronia Thompson Houston	Business and industry, education, labor
Larry A. Vick Houston	Insurance, judiciary, transportation
Craig A. Washington Houston	Criminal jurisprudence, judiciary, rules
Ron Waters Houston	Criminal jurisprudence, environmental affairs, labor
Ed R. Watson Deer Park	Environmental affairs, labor, natural resources
John S. Whitmire Houston	Appropriations, human resources, labor
Lindon Williams Houston	Chairman, business and industry; revenue and taxation

Table 92
BOND ELECTION - Houston, Texas*
February, 1973

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSITION		Property For	Non-Prop For	Property Against	Non-Prop Against
Proposition 1 - Street and Bridge 33 projects most to convert old, narrow streets to modern four lane divided streets. Included 9 bridges and grade separate projects.	50m	49217	4606	12484	697
Proposition 2 - Sanitary Sewer 39 specific projects. Plus construction of four treatment plants and expansion of another.	50m	49172	4597	12500	669
Proposition 3 - Public Library Construction of five library branches. Expansion of another and renovation of present central library.	4m	46942	4474	13649	752
Proposition 4 - Storm Sewage and Drainage Sixteen specific projects (not connected with paving) throughout the city.	17m	48952	4567	11983	690
Proposition 5 - Law Enforcement and Police Department New police academy, 500 car parking garage at central police station. Mini service centers at substation and helicopter hanger.	5m	49126	4357	11680	877
Proposition 6 - Fire Department Relocation of 9 fire stations, the reconstruction of two considered outdated, build [illegible] new stations and buy sites for 7 future stations.	6m	48865	4529	11838	714

BOND ELECTION CONT'D. Table 92

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSITION		Property For	Non-Prop For	Property Against	Non-Prop Against
Proposition 7 - Public Health Bonds Construction of 2 comprehensive health centers for Northwest and Southeast Houston expansion and rennovation of Blueridge and North Side Centers.	3m	46202	4489	12812	747
Proposition 8 - Parks and Recreation 4 swimming pools, 15 lighted ball fields, 10 tennis courts, 5 park shelters, more hike and bike trails and improvements at existing parks.	5m	46591	4523	13454	727
Proposition 9 - Traffic and Safety Control Bonds Installing modern traffic signals, hopefully at 100 intersections. Conversion to modern marked aluminum traffic signs and convert to reflectorized ceramic pavement markers on all major thoroughfares.	3m	48359	4515	12218	724
Proposition 10 - Solid Waste Management Garbage collection truck pool in Southeast part of Houston to cut down on driving time to pools and maintenance centers.	2m	47970	4508	12679	720

* Houston Post, February 25, 1973.

Table 93

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF VETERAN AND FRESHMEN BLACK CONGRESSMEN: ALL DEMOCRATS

COMMITTEE	REPRESENTATIVE
Appropriations	Rep. Louis Stokes, Ohio
Armed Services	Rep. Ronald V. Dellums, California
Banking and Currency	Rep. Parren J. Mitchell, Maryland Rep. Walter E. Fauntroy, D. C. Rep. Andrew Young, Georgia
District of Columbia	Rep. Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan Rep. Ronald V. Dellums, California Rep. Walter E. Fauntroy, D. C. Rep. Shirley Chisholm, New York
Foreign Affairs	Rep. Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan Rep. Robert Nix, Pennsylvania
Government Operations	Rep. John Conyers, Michigan
House Administration	Rep. Augustus Hawkins, California
Interior	Rep. Yvonne B. Burke, California
Commerce	Rep. Ralph H. Metcalfe, Illinois
Judiciary	Rep. John Conyers, Michigan Rep. Charles Rangel, New York Rep. Barbara Jordan, Texas
Merchant Marine	Rep. Ralph H. Metcalfe, Illinois
Post Office and Civil Service	Rep. Robert Nix, Pennsylvania Rep. William Clay, Missouri
Public Works	Rep. Yvonne B. Burke, California
Science	Rep. Charles Rangel, New York

Black congressmen now have from one to four members on every House standing committee, except:

Veterans
Rules
Standards of Official Conduct
Ways and Means (No vacancies)
Agriculture

Table 94

VOTER ANALYSIS IN PRESIDENT'S RACE

AREA	QUALIFIED	VOTED	MC GOVERN	NIXON	JENNESS
Youth	31,384	20,605-65.6%	6,839-33.7%	13,382-65.9%	64-0.3%
White Labor	10,104	6,769-66.9%	1,972-29.8%	4,621-70.0%	7-0.1%
Black	20,847	12,606-60.4%	11,621-95.5%	510-04.1%	26-0.2%
Mexican-American	13,779	6,909-50.1%	4,621-69.2%	2,024-30.3%	24-0.3%
Middle Income White	22,426	16,080-71.7%	2,972-18.7%	12,874-81.1%	14-0.0%
Affluent White	19,404	11,910-61.3%	2,949-25.2%	8,707-74.5%	22-0.1%
Low Income White	12,319	7,574-61.4%	3,064-41.3%	4,322-58.3%	15-0.2%
Baytown	18,011	11,805-65.5%	3,639-31.5%	7,816-67.7%	85-0.7%
Pasadena-Deer Park	43,941	30,427-69.2%	8,317-27.9%	21,388-71.7%	102-0.3%
Jac City-Galena Park	8,357	5,115-61.2%	2,587-51.9%	2,379-47.7%	18-0.3%
Bellaire-Wup-Southside	21,206	15,419-72.7%	4,028-26.7%	11,027-73.1%	23-0.1%
Westside Villages	10,694	7,409-70.0%	1,176-15.9%	6,203-83.9%	10-0.1%
Nasa Area	12,635	9,910-78.4%	1,588-16.1%	8,214-83.7%	9-0.0%
South Houston	4,791	2,777-57.9%	1,048-38.9%	1,642-60.9%	4-0.1%
Rural	7,212	5,009-69.4%	1,044-21.3%	3,818-78.1%	25-0.5%

Table 94 (Cont.)

VOTER ANALYSIS IN U.S. SENATE RACE

AREA	QUALIFIED	VOTED	SANDERS	TOWER	LEONARD	AMAYA
Youth	31,384	20,605-65.6%	8,875-44.1%	10,877-54.1%	143-0.7%	198-0.9%
White Labor	10,104	6,769-66.9%	3,106-47.1%	3,471-51.8%	23-0.3%	38-0.5%
Black	20,847	12,606-60.4%	11,040-95.2%	421-03.6%	60-0.5%	66-0.5%
Mexican-American	13,779	6,909-50.1%	4,264-68.2%	1,239-19.8%	49-0.7%	697-11.1%
Middle Income White	22,426	16,080-71.7%	4,816-30.5%	10,856-68.8%	45-0.2%	59-0.3%
Affluent White	19,404	11,910-61.3%	3,840-33.1%	7,423-64.1%	27-0.2%	278-2.4%
Low Income White	23,319	7,574-61.4%	4,010-55.5%	3,039-42.1%	39-0.5%	130-1.8%
Baytown	18,011	11,805-65.5%	5,644-49.6%	5,582-49.1%	53-0.4%	81-0.7%
Pasadena-Deer Park	43,941	30,427-69.2%	13,842-46.8%	15,425-52.2	108-0.3%	159-0.5%
Jac City-Galena Park	8,357	5,115-61.2%	3,174-65.9%	1,593-33.1%	18-0.3%	26-0.5%
Bellaire-Wup-Southside	21,206	15,419-72.7%	5,530-36.8%	9,354-62.2%	41-0.2%	102-0.6%
Westside Villages	10,694	7,490-70.7%	2,079-28.2%	5,246-71.2%	16-0.2%	23-0.3%
Nasa Area	12,635	9,910-78.4%	3,069-31.5%	6,588-67.7%	27-0.2%	45-0.4%
South Houston	4,791	2,777-57.9%	1,446-54.9%	1,140-43.2%	6-0.2%	41-1.5%
Rural	7,209	5,009-69.4%	1,870-39.1%	2,864-60.0%	29-0.6%	9-0.1%

Table 94 (Cont.)

VOTER ANALYSIS IN GOVERNOR'S RACE

AREA	QUALIFIED	VOTED	GROVER	BRISCOE	LEONARD	MUNIZ
Youth	31,384	20,605-65.6%	11,816-59.4%	6,368-32.0%	573-2.8%	1,124-5.6%
White Labor	10,104	6,769-66.9%	3,857-58.5%	2,470-37.5%	87-1.3%	166-2.5%
Black	20,847	12,606-60.4%	644-05.5%	10,681-91.6%	98-0.8%	236-2.0%
Mexican-American	13,779	6,908-50.1%	1,375-21.5%	3,581-56.1%	93-1.4%	1,331-20.8%
Middle Income White	22,426	16,080-71.7%	11,275-72.4%	3,739-24.0%	165-1.0%	380-2.4%
Affluent White	19,404	11,910-61.3%	7,253-62.9%	3,554-30.8%	109-0.9%	607-5.2%
Low Income White	12,319	7,874-63.9%	3,543-47.5%	3,528-47.3%	77-1.0%	302-4.0%
Baytown	18,011	11,805-65.5%	5,901-52.0%	5,165-45.5%	82-0.7%	188-1.6%
Pasadena-Deer Park	43,941	30,427-69.2%	17,083-57.5%	11,850-39.9%	221-0.7%	475-1.6%
Jac City-Galena Park	8,357	5,115-61.2%	1,785-36.6%	2,968-61.0%	33-0.6%	78-1.6%
Bellaire-Wup-Southside	21,206	15,419-72.7%	9,887-66.0%	4,389-29.3%	225-1.5%	464-3.1%
Westside Villages	10,694	7,490-70.0%	5,223-71.1%	1,908-26.0%	78-1.0%	128-1.7%
Nasa Area	12,635	9,910-78.4%	7,476-77.1%	1,886-19.4%	125-1.2%	208-2.1%
South Houston	4,791	2,777-57.9%	1,292-48.5%	1,231-46.2%	17-0.6%	121-4.5%
Rural	7,209	5,009-69.4%	2,896-60.3%	1,860-38.7%	29-0.6%	15-0.3%

CHAPTER 6

CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND THE MINORITY COMMUNITY

During the last several decades two theoretical trends have influenced the study of crime and the administration of justice. One such trend is directly related to the theory of bureaucratic organizations, particularly the structural pressures which influence the behavior of individuals charged with the responsibility of administering justice and enforcing legislation. The theory of bureaucracy, developed by Max Weber and extended by such scholars as Blau and Selznick, provides a difficult orientation to an understanding of the workings of the Criminal Justice System.[1] Sociological interests deviate, in some way, from views held by legal scholars. To the former, the organismic approach to an understanding of police behavior and its influence on the criminal justice system occupies prominence in understanding the phenomenon of crime. The importance of police behavior from a social, as well as a legal point of view, is underscored in an article found in _Crisis in American Institutions_.[2]

Another trend which has occupied considerable attention during the last half of the twentieth century was the developing theory of social deviance, as reflected in the writings of Becker, Goffman, and others.[3] The importance of defining the deviant act is considered central in determining whether or not an individual is regarded as a criminal or placed in a peculiar stigmatized category. McNamara and Niederhoffer, in studying the police as a group, found that "police represent the attitudes of the social groups from which they are drawn." It is assumed from this assertion that the racial factor is also reflected in such attitudes.

A comprehensive study of the racial factor in the length of prison sentences was completed by Bullock in 1961. Having studied black criminality for many years, the author sought to examine the differential treatment by juries in the assessment of punishment through his study of 3,644 inmates in a Texas state prison. The conclusions drawn in this work support the theory of social deviance and the influence of attitudes and behavior on the definition of the deviant act by police. Bullock concludes his excellent study with this theoretical suggestion: "Those who enforce the law conform to the norms of their local society concerning racial prejudice, thus denying equality before the law. That criminal statistics reflect social customs, values, and prejudices appears to be further validated." [4] A broader and more subtle suggestion implied through his findings is that any criminality attributed to the black community -- statistical or analytical -- should be viewed within the framework of the aforementioned theoretical perspectives.

RACE AND CRIME

The relative criminality of blacks, as opposed to whites in terms of raw statistical representation, has not been adequately explained. Local and national statistics on crime do not give an accurate picture of the proportionate number of crimes committed by the two groups, or the number of arrests actually made. For instance, figures shown in the Uniform Crime Reports, published by the FBI, are -- for the most part -- incomplete. "The lack of a uniform methodology in record keeping is responsible for a segment of the problem" relating to disproportionate representation of blacks in statistics on crime. [5]

In a discussion of race and crime, The Negro Yearbook (1966) points to particular aspects of the problem.

> As long as such differences in the character and efficiency of the police; differences in community attitudes; differences in the caliber of prosecution, in the judicial interpretation of the courts, and differences in the bias of judges obtained; the value of comparative statistics on this subject will be debatable.

It should be noted that the actual operation of the system of criminal justice is broader than administrative processes which enhance the bureaucratic organization. Instead, crime must be viewed not only as a type of social protest, but also as a symbol of a breakdown in traditional values -- social as well as technological. The extremes from which criminals are drawn: black and white; rich and poor; white collar and blue collar, are indicative of unrest and dissatisfaction in society which is not necessarily racial or economic. Criminal activity, irrespective of race or class, may be more symptomatic of differential value systems and institutional inadequacies. Additionally, any interpretation of the true incidence of crime must take into account the nature of the offense, the conviction process, and the accurate assessment of the basis of legal representation.

It is the purpose of this chapter to present statistics on crime for Houston, with some data for the nation as a whole. We do this with full knowledge that any conclusions drawn from such data are dependent upon the adequacy of the labeling process and other operational characteristics inherent in the bureaucratic structures of police departments and law enforcement agencies. The basis of the operational character of the criminal justice system includes the determination of criminal conduct, discretion within the system, plea bargaining, convictions, acquittals, charge reductions, and/or accommodations.

It should be noted that criminal statistics for Houston were difficult to obtain. The Annual Reports of the Police Department in Houston contain limited data by race. Some comparative data were taken from the Uniform Crime Reports published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

STATISTICS ON CRIME

The data on crime include a classification of offenses by age, race, and sex for persons under 18 years of age and for those over 18 years of age. Table 95 shows a distribution of persons arrested in Houston in 1970 under the age of 18 years. As the data indicate, white persons falling within this age group predominated such categories as auto theft (69%); arson (74%); vandalism and fraud (70% and 71%, respectively); driving under the influence of alcohol (75%). Drug addiction, marijuana, and other dangerous non-narcotics were offenses which ranged from 85 percent to 90 percent.

Blacks in Houston under 18 years of age, are arrested for the more serious offenses, and from the percentage and frequency distribution, as shown in Tables 95 through 98, they are disproportionately represented in the more serious criminal offenses. Blacks make up about 25 percent of the population of Houston , but they were arrested more often than whites for offenses such as murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, possession of weapons, and gambling. In terms of all offenses, for those under 18 years of age, whites were arrested in 62 percent of the cases; blacks were arrested in 38 percent of the cases. Blacks, under 18, were arrested for 85 percent of all offenses involving forcible rape; 86 percent of all offenses involving gambling; 74 percent

TABLE 95
RACE OF PERSONS ARRESTED UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE

Classification of Offenses	RACE					ALL OTHER	
	Total	White	%	Black	%	Oriental Indian, etc.	%
Murder & nonnegligent Manslaughter........................	15	7	47	8	53		
Murder by negligence.................	6	4	67	2	33		
Forcible rape........................	33	5	15	28	85		
Robbery..............................	213	55	26	158	74		
Aggravated assault...................	59	23	39	36	61		
Burglary - Breaking or entering.......	1450	827	57	623	43		
Larceny - Theft (Except auto theft)...	3625	1904	53	1721	47		
Auto theft...........................	818	566	69	252	31		
Other assaults.......................	552	245	44	307	56		
Arson................................	75	55	74	20	26		
Forgery & counterfeiting.............	55	35	64	20	36		
Fraud................................	181	129	71	52	29		
Embezzlement.........................	0	0	0	0	0		
Stolen Property: Buying, receiving, possessing.........................	3	2	67	1	33		
Vandalism............................	627	437	70	190	30		
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc...	167	93	56	74	44		
Prostitution and commercialized vice..	42	21	50	21	50		
Sex offenses (Except forcible rape & prostitution).....................	49	27	55	22	45		
Opium or cocaine & their derivatives (morphine, heroin, codeine)...... a.	12	12	100	0	0		
Marijuana......................... b.	420	380	90	40	10		
Synthetic narcotics - manufactured narcotics which can cause true drug addiction (Demerol, Methadones... c.	0	0	0	0	0		
Other dangerous non-narcotic drugs (Barbiturates, Benzedrine)....... d.	89	76	85	13	15		
Narcotic Drug Laws - Total...........	521	468	90	53	10		
Gambling - Total.....................	81	12	14	75	86		
Bookmaking (Horse & sport book).......	0	0	0	0	0		
Numbers & Lottery....................	0	0	0	0	0		
All other gambling...................	87	12	14	75	86		
Offenses against family and children..	0	0	0	0	0		
Driving under the influence..........	12	9	75	3	25		
Liquor Laws..........................	725	629	87	96	13		
Drunkenness..........................	443	314	70	129			
Disorderly conduct...................	760	451	70	309	30		
Vagrancy.............................	1032	758	73	273	26	1	1
All other offenses (Except traffic)...	781	494	63	286	36	1	1
Suspicion............................	1903	1283	67	620	33		
Curfew & loitering law violations.....	0	0	0	0	0		
Run-aways............................	139	120	87	19	13		
TOTAL..........................	14373	8973	62	5398	38	2	

TABLE 96
SEX OF PERSONS ARRESTED UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE

Classification of Offenses	Total	Male	%	Female	%
Murder & nonnegligent Manslaughter........................	15	13	87	2	13
Manslaughter by negligence............	6	5	83	1	17
Forcible rape........................	33	33	100		0
Robbery..............................	213	203	95	10	5
Aggravated assault...................	59	48	81	11	19
Burglary - Breaking or entering.......	1450	1330	92	120	8
Larceny - Theft (Except auto theft)...	3625	2447	68	1178	32
Auto theft...........................	818	784	96	34	4
Other assaults.......................	552	422	76	130	24
Arson................................	75	70	93	5	7
Forgery and counterfeiting...........	55	40	73	15	27
Fraud................................	181	154	85	27	15
Embezzlement.........................	0	0	---	0	---
Stolen Property: Buying, receiving, possessing..........................	3	2	67	1	33
Vandalism............................	627	587	94	40	6
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc...	167	152	91	15	9
Prostitution & commercialized vice....	42	13	31	29	69
Sex offenses (Except forcible rape & prostitution)......................	49	48	98	1	2
Narcotic Drug Laws - Total............	521	412	79	109	21
Opium or cocaine & their derivatives (morphine, heroin, codeine) a.	12	6	50	6	50
Marijuana b.	420	346	82	74	18
Synthetic narcotics - manufactured narcotics which can cause true drug addiction (Demerol, Methadones) c.	0	0	---	0	---
Other dangerous non-narcotic drugs Barbiturates, Benzedrine d.	89	60	67	29	33
Gambling - Total.....................	87	86	99	1	1
Bookmaking (Horse & sport book) a.	0	0	---	0	---
Numbers & Lottery b.	0	0	---	0	---
All other gambling....... c.	87	86	99	1	1
Offenses against family & children....	0	0	---	0	---
Driving under the influence..........	12	11	92	1	8
Liquor Laws..........................	725	609	84	116	16
Drunkenness..........................	443	415	94	28	6
Disorderly conduct...................	760	633	83	127	17
Vagrancy.............................	1032	840	81	192	19
All other offenses (Except traffic)...	781	704	90	77	10
Suspicion............................	1903	1552	82	351	16
Curfew & Loitering Law Violations.....	0	0	---	0	---
Run-aways............................	139	76	55	63	45
TOTAL...........................		14373			

TABLE 97
RACE OF PERSONS ARRESTED
18 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER

Classification of Offenses	Total	White	RACE %	Black	%	ALL OTHER Oriental Indian, etc.	%
Murder & nonnegligent Manslaughter	180	67	37	113	63		
Murder by negligence	25	13	52	12	48		
Forcible rape	136	56	41	79	58	1	1
Robbery	630	189	30	441	70		
Aggravated assault	413	129	32	284	68		
Burglary - Breaking or entering	1328	682	51	646	49	1	
Larceny - Theft (Except auto theft)	3884	1997		1886			
Auto Theft	623	333	53	290	47		
Other assaults	2049	1185	58	864	42		
Arson	60	32	53	28	47		
Forgery & conterfeiting	481	231	48	250	52		
Fraud	519	332	64	187	36		
Embezzlement	16	13	82	3	18		
Stolen Property: Buying, receiving, possessing	35	29	83	6	17		
Vandalism	346	240	69	106	31		
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	1535	648	42	887	58		
Prostitution and commercialized vice	6029	1187	20	4842	80		
Sex offenses (Except forcible rape & prostitution	246	194	79	52	21		
Narcotic Drug Laws - Total	1351	894	66	457	34		
Opium or cocaine & their derivatives (morphine, heroin, codeine) a.	217	156	72	61	28		
Marijuana b.	879	577	66	302	34		
Synthetic narcotics - manufactured narcotics which can cause true drug addiction (Demerol, methadones)	2	2	100	0			
Other dangerous non-narcotic drugs (Barbiturates, Benzedrine) d.	253	159	62	94	38		
Gambling - Total	3064	559	18	2505	82		
Bookmaking (Horse & Sport Book) a.	31	31	100	0			
Numbers & Lottery b.	3	2	67	1	33		
All other gambling c.	3030	526	17	2504	83		
Offenses against family & children	1	0		1	100		
Driving under the influence	2894	2047	71	847	29		
Liquor laws	2472	1533	62	939	38		
Drunkenness	21782	17402	79	4378	20	2	1
Disorderly conduct	1728	1160	67	568	33		
Vagrancy	1389	893	65	495	35	1	
All other offenses (Except traffic)	1336	713	47	623	53		
Suspicion	2788	1563	56	1225	44		
TOTAL	57340	34321	59	23014	40	5	1

TABLE 98
SEX OF PERSONS ARRESTED 18 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER

Classification of Offenses		Total	Male	%	Female	%
Murder and nonnegligent Manslaughter		180	144	80	36	20
Manslaughter by negligence		25	23	92	2	8
Forcible rape		136	134	99	2	1
Robbery		630	559	89	11	11
Aggravated assault		413	334	81	79	19
Burglary - Breaking or entering		1328	1244	94	84	6
Larceny - Theft (Except auto theft)		3884	2316	60	1568	40
Auto theft		623	595	96	28	4
Other assaults		2049	1858	91	191	9
Arson		60	47	78	13	22
Forgery & counterfeiting		481	352	73	129	27
Fraud		519	428	82	91	18
Embezzlement		16	12	75	4	25
Stolen Property: Buying, receiving, possessing		35	29	83	6	17
Vandalism		346	300	87	46	13
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc		1535	1342	87	193	13
Prostitution & commercialized vice		6029	439	7	5590	93
Sex offenses (Except forcible rape & prostitution)		246	240	98	6	2
Narcotic Drug Laws - Total		1351	1166	86	185	14
Opium or cocaine and their derivatives (morphine, heroin and codeine)	a.	217	172	79	45	21
Marijuana	b.	879	800	91	79	9
Synthetic narcotics - manufactured narcotics which can cause true drug addiction (Demerol, Methadones)		2	2	100		0
Other dangerous non-narcotic drugs (Barbiturates, Benzedrine)	d.	253	192	76	61	24
Gambling - Total		3064	2913	95	151	5
Bookmaking (Horse & sport book)	a.	31	28	90	3	10
Numbers and Lottery	b.	3	3	100		0
All other gambling	c.	3030	2882	95	148	5
Offenses against family & children		1	0	0	1	100
Driving under the influence		2894	2667	92	227	8
Liquor Laws		2472	1961	79	511	21
Drunkenness		21782	20530	94	1252	6
Disorderly conduct		1728	1493	86	235	14
Vagrancy		1389	1259	91	130	9
All other offenses (Except traffic)		1336	1105	83	231	17
Suspicion		2788	2281	82	507	18
TOTAL		51340				

of all cases involving robbery; and 53 percent of all arrests involving murder and nonnegligent manslaughter involved blacks in Houston, according to figures contained in the Annual Report of the Police Department for 1970.

For individuals 18 years of age and over, arrest statistics are similar to those for persons younger in age. Whites were arrested more for marijuana and other types of drug abuse than were blacks. The more serious crimes, however, show a disproportionate representation for black adults. Robbery, aggravated assault, carrying and possessing weapons, burglary, and gambling are the leading categories where black arrests surpass those for whites. The crimes of violence, prostitution and commercialized vice are those for which black adults are more often arrested. Blacks 18 years of age and over were arrested more often for counterfeiting and forgery than whites or blacks under 18 years of age.

For all arrests in the city for 1970, males were arrested more often than females for all offenses. The total number of arrests for persons 18 years of age and over was 57,340 for 1970; for those 18 years of age and under, the number was 14,373.

Criminal statistics on arrests by race for Houston compare favorably with those for the United States as a whole. Data published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 1971 included figures presented by 4,088 agencies, representing a breakdown of arrests for city and suburban areas. Data are supplied for several racial and ethnic categories, including thirty-two major crime classifications. Percentages for "other races" include all races other than blacks and whites.

NATIONAL STATISTICS ON CRIME

For the nation as a whole, blacks have the greater percentage of arrests in the Criminal Homicide category, with a rate of 67.6 percent of the arrests for murder as compared with 30 percent for whites and less than three percent for other races. This percentage represents almost three times black proportionate population representation in cities throughout this country. Whites are more likely to be arrested for manslaughter than blacks. The percentage rates for whites and blacks are reversed when compared for such classification as murder versus manslaughter. In these classifications, the percentage of arrests of blacks for murder is 67.7 percent; whites are arrested for manslaughter in about 71.1 percent of the cases while blacks are arrested in 26.2 percent of the cases.

In the crime classifications for "Forcible Rape", "Robbery," and "Aggravated Assault," members of the black population dominate each of these categories. In fact, blacks are arrested in greater percentages than whites and in twice as great numbers than their percentage distribution in the population. Tables 99, 100, and 101 represent total city arrests, for the United States in 1971, for persons under 18 years of age, and 18 years of age and over, by race and sex.

CRIME - TABLE 99
CITY ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971

Offense Charged	Arrest under 18				Percent Distribution		
	Total	White	Negro	All Others	White	Negro	All Others
Total-------------------------	1,357,221	959,564	367,643	30,014	70.7	27.1	2.3
Criminal homicide:							
(a)Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	1,104	244	829	31	22.1	75.1	2.8
(b)Manslaughter by negligence	151	105	37	9	69.5	24.5	6.0
Forcible rape	2,529	846	1,636	47	33.5	64.7	1.8
Robbery	22,821	5,233	17,071	517	22.9	74.8	2.1
Aggravated assault	17,263	7,316	9,583	364	42.4	55.5	2.1
Burglary-breaking or entering	114,084	69,645	42,041	2,398	61.0	36.9	2.2
Larceny-theft	263,559	178,381	79,445	5,733	67.7	30.1	2.2
Auto theft	53,226	33,255	18,596	1,375	62.5	34.9	2.6
Violent crime	43,717	13,639	29,119	959	31.2	66.6	2.2
Property crime	430,869	281,281	140,082	9,506	65.3	32.5	2.1
Subtotal for above offenses	474,737	295,025	169,238	10,474	62.1	35.6	2.1
Other assaults	45,523	22,379	22,083	1,061	49.2	48.5	2.2
Arson	4,571	3,376	1,151	44	73.9	25.2	1.0
Forgery and counterfeiting	3,046	2,199	802	45	72.2	26.3	1.5
Fraud	2,997	1,620	1,332	45	54.1	44.4	1.4
Embezzlement	221	180	40	1	81.4	18.1	.5
Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing	15,436	9,765	5,442	229	63.3	35.3	1.5
Vandalism	65,652	51,755	12,981	916	78.8	19.8	1.3
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	13,924	7,312	6,247	365	52.5	44.9	2.5
Prostitution and commercialized vice	1,096	422	663	11	38.5	60.5	1.0
Sex offenses (Except forcible rape and prostitution	7,695	4,967	2,573	155	64.5	33.4	2.0
Narcotic drug laws	61,810	53,461	7,156	923	86.5	11.6	2.1
Gambling	1,800	329	1,416	55	18.3	78.7	3.1
Offenses against family and children	563	477	81	5	84.7	14.4	.9
Driving under the influence	4,007	3,641	282	84	90.9	7.0	2.0
Liquor laws	61,008	57,188	2,446	1,374	93.7	4.0	2.2
Drunkenness	34,169	28,707	3,458	2,004	84.0	10.1	5.9
Disorderly conduct	111,377	71,305	37,625	2,447	64.0	33.8	2.2
Vagrancy	7,732	5,423	2,049	260	70.1	26.5	3.3
All other offenses (Except traffic)	198,896	145,914	49,302	3,680	73.4	24.8	1.8
Suspicion	16,185	12,460	3,666	59	77.0	22.7	.4
Curfew and loitering law violations	89,473	67,891	19,393	2,189	75.9	21.7	2.5
Runaways	135,303	113,768	18,217	3,318	84.1	13.5	2.5

CRIME - TABLE 100
CITY ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971 - CON'T

Offense Charged	Arrests 18 and over				Percent Distribution		
	Total	White	Negro	All others	White	Negro	All others
Total------------------------------	3,972,581	2,623,139	1,198,152	151,290	66.0	30.2	3.9
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	9,201	2,899	6,088	214	31.5	66.2	2.3
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	1,569	1,116	418	35	71.1	26.6	2.3
Forcible rape	9,011	3,816	5,035	160	42.3	55.9	1.7
Robbery	47,522	14,884	31,637	1,001	31.3	66.6	4.4
Aggravated assault	79,574	36,994	40,747	1,833	46.5	51.2	2.3
Burglary-breaking or entering	105,297	60,703	42,521	2,073	57.6	40.4	2.1
Larceny-theft	258,827	163,197	89,738	5,892	63.1	34.7	2.3
Auto theft	44,640	24,416	18,943	1,281	54.7	42.4	3.8
Violent crime	145,308	58,593	83,507	3,208	40.3	57.5	2.1
Property crime	408,764	248,316	151,202	9,246	60.7	37.0	2.3
Subtotal for above offenses	555,641	308,025	235,127	12,489	55.4	42.3	2.3
Other assaults	190,133	109,994	76,608	3,531	57.9	40.3	1.8
Arson	3,496	2,078	1,318	100	59.4	37.7	2.8
Forgery and counterfeiting	26,285	16,454	9,595	236	62.6	36.5	.8
Fraud	54,823	37,735	16,608	480	68.8	30.3	.8
Embezzlement	4,949	3,514	1,399	45	71.0	28.1	.9
Stolen Property: Buying, receiving, possessing	30,103	17,052	12,559	492	56.6	41.7	1.6
Vandalism	25,028	16,606	7,799	623	66.3	31.2	2.5
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	72,339	30,612	40,245	1,482	42.3	55.6	2.0
Prostitution and commercialized vice	38,343	13,342	24,516	485	34.8	63.9	1.3
Sex offenses (Except forcible rape and prostitution	30,256	22,736	6,712	808	75.1	22.2	2.7
Narcotic drug laws	200,914	141,696	56,589	2,629	70.5	28.2	1.3
Gambling	67,249	16,392	48,031	2,826	24.4	71.4	4.2
Offenses against family and children	29,735	18,235	11,112	370	61.4	37.4	1.2
Driving under the influence	356,969	277,781	69,514	9,674	77.8	19.5	2.7
Liquor laws	111,256	90,614	17,869	2,773	81.4	16.1	2.4
Drunkenness	1,261,817	909,028	266,432	86,357	72.0	21.1	6.8
Disorderly conduct	420,831	254,858	151,639	14,334	60.6	36.0	3.3
Vagrancy	44,641	31,648	11,831	1,162	70.9	26.5	2.5
All other offenses (Except traffic)	414,874	283,305	121,696	9,873	68.3	29.3	2.4
Suspicion	32,899	21,416	10,962	521	65.1	33.3	1.6
Curfew and loitering law violations	---------	---------	---------	--------	----	----	----
Runaways	---------	---------	---------	--------	----	----	----

CITY ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971- CON'T
(4,088 agencies; 1971 estimated population 104,783,000)

Offense Charged	Total Arrests				Percent Distribution		
	Total	White	Negro	All others	White	Negro	All others
Total----------------------------	5,570,013	3,728,646	1,656,386	184,981	66.9	29.7	3.4
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	10,966	3,286	7,428	252	30.0	67.7	2.3
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	1,841	1,309	428	50	71.1	26.2	2.7
Forcible rape	12,152	4,971	6,967	214	40.9	57.3	1.7
Robbery	74,643	21,154	51,941	1,548	28.3	69.6	2.1
Aggravated assault	101,389	46,336	52,825	2,228	45.7	52.1	2.2
Burglary-breaking or entering	232,111	137,701	89,857	4,553	59.3	38.7	2.1
Larceny-theft	558,029	364,173	181,980	11,876	65.3	32.6	2.1
Auto theft	101,517	59,581	39,229	2,707	58.7	38.6	2.6
Violent crime	199,150	75,747	119,161	4,242	38.0	59.8	2.1
Property crime	891,657	561,455	311,066	19,136	63.0	34.9	2.2
Subtotal for above offenses	1,092,648	638,511	430,709	23,428	58.4	39.4	2.2
Other assaults	244,974	137,845	102,471	4,658	56.3	41.8	1.9
Arson	8,683	5,879	2,658	146	67.7	30.6	1.8
Forgery and couterfeiting	30,966	19,507	11,168	291	63.0	36.1	.8
Fraud	60,931	41,104	19,280	547	67.5	31.6	.9
Embezzlement	5,526	3,969	1,505	52	71.8	27.2	.9
Stolen Property: Buying, receiving, possessing	49,194	28,728	19,725	741	58.4	40.1	1.5
Vandalism	96,668	73,192	21,898	1,578	75.7	22.7	1.5
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	92,055	39,978	50,187	1,890	43.4	54.5	2.1
Prostitution and commercialized vice	42,789	14,800	27,482	570	34.6	64.2	1.2
Sex offenses (Except forcible rape and prostitution)	39,308	28,759	9,577	972	73.2	24.4	2.5
Narcotic drug laws	278,326	204,817	69,616	3,893	73.6	25.0	1.5
Gambling	69,845	16,934	50,030	2,881	24.2	71.6	4.2
Offenses against family and children	32,694	19,988	12,310	396	61.1	37.7	1.2
Driving under the influence	379,959	296,392	72,518	11,049	78.0	19.1	2.9
Liquor laws	183,611	157,399	21,953	4,259	85.7	12.0	2.3
Drunkenness	1,324,159	958,814	275,875	89,470	72.4	20.8	6.8
Disorderly conduct	546,212	336,773	192,571	16,868	61.7	35.3	3.0
Vagrancy	53,543	37,733	14,367	1,443	70.5	26.8	2.7
All other offenses (Except traffic)	664,062	451,989	198,248	13,825	68.1	29.9	2.1
Suspicion	49,034	33,876	14,628	580	69.0	29.8	1.2
Curfew and loitering law violations	89,473	67,891	19,393	2,189	75.9	21.7	2.5
Runaways	135,303	113,768	18,217	3,318	84.1	13.5	2.5

As shown in the tables cited above, when statistics for arrests are viewed, using age as a variable, the percentage distribution for those arrested under 18 years of age is higher than for those arrested for the age group, 18 years of age and over. In the "Under 18 Years" category, blacks lead the number of arrests for murder, with a percentage representation of 75.1 percent. The figure is about 9 percent higher than those arrested for the same offense, 18 years of age and over. Whites are arrested more often for "Property Crime," the illegal use and sale of drugs, and white collar crimes such as forgery, embezzlement, and counterfeiting. The aforementioned data are representative of crimes which occur in cities and for which individuals are arrested.

City Arrests vs. Suburban Arrests

In the suburbs, whites make up the major arrests for all categories of crime. The percentage distribution of arrests in "suburbia" includes 83.5 percent for whites and about 15 percent for blacks. In the cities, blacks are twice as likely to be arrested for murder as whites. This figure decreases when suburban arrests are considered. When whites are compared with whites, for city in relation to the suburbs, the rate of suburban arrests is greatest for areas involving property crimes. Crimes of violence, including murder and manslaughter, are higher when viewed in terms of suburban arrests. Most of these offenses and arrests involve white persons.

Tables 102, 103, and 104 contain statistics on arrests for offenses committed in suburban areas for the United States in 1971. Tables 105, 106, and 107 are summaries of total arrests in the United States by race and offense for the same period.

DIMENSIONS OF THE CRISIS OF CRIME

In his 1968 State of the Union address, the late President Lyndon B. Johnson made a firm commitment to fight crime. The Congress of the United States at that time voiced its sentiment through sustained applause to his pledge. The response of Congress to late President Johnson's pledge was viewed as a response to the desires of its constituency. In the years that followed, President Nixon reaffirmed Johnson's commitment to eradicate crime in America, and during the campaign for his first term of office as President, his total strategy for his political game plan involved the slogan, "law and order." The Nixonian political strategy symbolized a national preoccupation with this issue. Unfortunately, the issue of law and order was eventually viewed as a culturally acceptable slogan to camouflage racial and class prejudices. To many blacks, the Nixon-oriented slogan of law and order was a means of making white Americans comfortable in their prejudices. Despite President Nixon's alleged commitment to the alleviation of crime in America, the rising level of crime and violence continues.

In Houston, as has happened in other cities, the crime problem has become serious enought to elicit common fears among blacks and

CRIME - TABLE 102
SUBURBAN ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971

Offense Charged	Arrest under 18				Percent Distribution		
	Total	White	Negro	All Others	White	Negro	All Others
Total-----------------------------	498,956	437,497	58,120	3,339	87.7	11.6	0.7
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	166	87	75	4	52.4	45.2	2.4
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	55	50	4	1	90.9	7.3	1.8
Forcible rape	582	399	176	7	68.6	30.2	1.2
Robbery	3,809	1,769	2,024	16	46.4	53.1	.4
Aggravated assault	5,095	3,528	1,523	44	69.2	29.9	.8
Burglary-breaking or entering	41,018	33,938	6,773	307	82.7	16.5	.7
Larceny-theft	85,740	70,732	14,523	792	82.5	16.9	.5
Auto theft	15,758	12,879	2,775	104	81.7	17.6	.7
Violent crime	9,652	5,783	3,798	71	59.9	39.3	.7
Property crime	142,516	117,549	24,071	896	82.5	16.9	.6
Subtotal for above offenses	152,223	123,382	27,873	968	81.1	18.3	.6
Other assaults	13,037	9,556	3,426	55	73.3	26.3	.4
Arson	1,884	1,687	191	6	89.5	10.1	.4
Forgery and counterfeiting	999	832	160	7	83.3	16.0	.7
Fraud	637	544	91	2	85.4	14.3	.4
Embezzlement	126	117	8	1	92.9	6.3	.8
Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing	5,991	4,599	1,364	28	76.8	22.8	.5
Vandalism	29,449	27,239	2,070	140	92.5	7.0	.4
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	3,840	3,101	715	24	80.8	18.6	.6
Prostitution and commercialized vice	79	53	25	1	67.1	31.6	1.3
Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)	2,852	2,400	437	15	84.2	15.3	.4
Narcotic drug laws	27,799	26,362	1,304	133	94.8	4.7	.5
Gambling	260	168	92	---	64.6	35.4	---
Offenses against family and children	363	327	35	1	90.1	9.6	.3
Driving under the influence	1,551	1,508	31	12	97.2	2.0	.7
Liquor laws	26,998	26,225	516	257	97.1	1.9	.9
Drunkenness	12,984	12,111	689	184	93.3	5.3	1.4
Disorderly conduct	36,695	31,700	4,777	218	86.4	13.0	.5
Vagrancy	1,716	1,566	143	7	91.3	8.3	.4
All other offenses (except traffic)	76,736	68,324	7,977	435	89.0	10.4	.5
Suspicion	6,505	5,772	726	7	88.7	11.2	.1
Curfew and loitering law viclations	28,016	26,333	1,504	179	94.0	5.4	.7
Runaways	68,216	63,519	3,966	659	93.2	5.8	.9

CRIME - TABLE 103
SUBURBAN ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971 - CONT.

Offense Charged	Arrests 18 and Over				Percent Distribution		
	Total	White	Negro	All Others	White	Negro	All Others
Total ----------------------------	966,349	788,415	165,425	12,509	81.6	17.1	1.3
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	1,904	1,074	814	16	56.4	42.8	.9
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	642	540	98	4	84.1	15.3	.5
Forcible rape	2,503	1,800	780	23	69.2	30.0	.8
Robbery	9,737	5,132	4,537	68	52.7	46.6	.7
Aggravated assault	24,418	17,145	7,034	239	70.2	28.8	.9
Burglary-breaking or entering	33,850	26,660	6,982	208	78.8	20.6	.6
Larceny-theft	74,541	56,376	17,444	721	75.6	23.4	1.0
Auto theft	11,053	8,242	2,686	125	74.6	24.3	1.1
Violent crime	38,662	25,151	13,165	346	65.1	34.1	.9
Property crime	119,444	91,278	27,112	1,054	76.4	22.7	1.0
Subtotal for above offenses	158,748	116,969	40,375	1,404	73.7	25.4	.9
Other assaults	56,460	43,018	13,086	356	76.2	23.2	.6
Arson	832	652	172	8	78.4	20.7	.9
Forgery and counterfeiting	9,382	7,216	2,108	58	76.9	22.5	.5
Fraud	24,378	19,937	4,392	49	81.8	18.0	.2
Embezzlement	1,260	1,040	198	22	82.5	15.7	1.8
Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing	11,190	8,339	2,773	78	74.5	24.8	.6
Vandalism	7,064	6,032	973	59	85.4	13.8	.8
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	14,739	9,681	4,942	116	65.7	33.5	.7
Prostitution and commercialized vice	2,557	1,621	915	21	63.4	35.8	.8
Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)	7,985	7,163	755	67	89.7	9.5	.9
Narcotic drug laws	69,494	60,421	8,764	309	86.9	12.6	.4
Gambling	6,086	3,476	2,586	24	57.1	42.5	.4
Offenses against family and children	15,850	12,397	3,309	144	78.2	20.9	.9
Driving under the influence	113,147	101,443	10,605	1,099	89.7	9.4	.9
Liquor laws	34,072	31,512	2,175	385	92.5	6.4	1.1
Drunkenness	189,394	156,811	26,670	5,913	82.8	14.1	3.0
Disorderly conduct	82,211	67,638	13,869	604	82.4	16.9	.7
Vagrancy	7,209	5,643	1,467	99	78.3	20.3	1.4
All other offenses (except traffic)	146,794	121,258	23,876	1,660	82.6	16.3	1.1
Suspicion	7,497	6,048	1,415	34	80.7	18.9	.4
Curfew and loitering law violations							
Runaways							

SOURCE: Uniform Crime Reports, FBI (1971).

CRIME - TABLE 104
SUBURBAN ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971 - CONT.
(2,207 agencies; 1971 estimated population 47,302,000)

Offense Charged	Total Arrests				Percent Distribution		
	Total	White	Negro	All others	White	Negro	All others
Total----------------------------------	1,563,018	1,304,439	239,660	18,919	83.5	15.3	1.2
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	2,219	1,221	971	27	55.0	43.8	1.2
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	750	628	106	16	83.7	14.1	2.2
Forcible rape	3,405	2,365	1,008	32	69.5	29.6	.9
Robbery	14,715	7,387	7,228	100	50.2	49.1	.7
Aggravated assault	31,082	21,677	9,103	302	69.7	29.3	.9
Burglary-breaking or entering	80,357	65,010	14,767	580	80.9	18.4	1.1
Larceny-theft	174,606	138,078	35,152	1376	79.1	20.1	.7
Auto theft	28,228	22,183	5,765	280	78.6	20.4	.9
Violent crime	51,421	32,650	18,310	461	63.5	35.6	.9
Property crime	283,191	225,271	55,684	2236	79.5	19.7	.8
Subtotal for above offenses	335,362	258,549	74,100	2713	77.1	22.1*	.8
Other assaults	72,621	54,926	17,255	440	75.6	23.8	.6
Arson	2,939	2,545	377	17	86.6	12.8	.5
Forgery and counterfeiting	11,059	8,516	2,475	68	77.0	22.4	.6
Fraud	26,278	21,405	4,813	60	81.5	18.3	.2
Embezzlement	1,558	1,304	229	25	83.7	14.7	1.6
Stolen property: Buying, receiving, possessing	18,952	14,152	4,682	186	74.7	24.7	.6
Vandalism	39,252	35,739	3,299	214	91.1	8.4	.5
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	20,311	13,866	6,273	172	68.3	30.9	.8
Prostitution and commercialized vice	2,684	1,687	975	21	62.9	36.3	.8
Sex offenses (Except forcible rape and prostitution)	11,491	10,098	1,306	87	87.9	11.4	.7
Narcotic drug laws	104,272	92,685	11,109	478	88.9	10.7	.4
Gambling	6,447	3,685	2,738	24	57.2	42.5	.3
Offenses against family and children	17,730	14,022	3,557	151	79.1	20.1	.8
Driving under the influence	125,726	111,253	11,319	3,154	88.5	9.0	2.5
Liquor laws	69,241	65,635	2,858	748	98.4	4.1	1.1
Drunkenness	213,457	178,636	28,502	6,319	83.7	13.4	2.9
Disorderly conduct	125,542	104,669	20,017	856	83.4	15.9	.7
Vagrancy	9,014	7,288	1,620	106	80.9	18.0	1.2
All other offenses (Except traffic)	238,848	202,035	34,545	2,268	84.6	14.5	.9
Suspicion	14,002	11,820	2,141	41	84.4	15.3	.2
Curfew and loitering law violations	28,016	26,333	1,504	418	94.0	5.4	.7
Runaways	68,216	63,591	3,966	659	93.2	5.8	.9

TABLE 105

TOTAL ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971

Offense Charged	Arrests under 18				Percent Distribution		
	Total	White	Negro	All Others	White	Negro	All Others
Total ------------------------	1,617,567	1,189,933	393,095	34,539	73.6	24.3	2.2
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	1,278	861	877	40	28.2	68.6	3.1
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	210	154	45	11	73.3	21.4	5.4
Forcible rape	3,006	1,174	1,764	36	39.1	58.7	2.1
Robbery	24,947	6,332	18,080	535	25.4	72.5	2.0
Aggravated assault	20,655	9,680	10,545	430	46.9	51.1	2.1
Burglary-breaking or entering	144,076	95,220	45,928	2,928	66.1	31.9	2.0
Larceny-theft	296,543	206,147	84,303	6,093	69.5	28.4	2.1
Auto theft	63,288	41,684	20,029	1,575	65.9	31.6	2.5
Violent crime	49,886	17,548	31,266	1,072	35.2	62.7	2.1
Property crime	503,907	343,051	150,260	10,596	68.1	29.8	2.1
Subtotal for above offenses	554,003	360,753	181,571	11,679	65.1	32.8	2.1
Other assaults	51,728	27,123	23,486	1,119	52.4	45.4	2.1
Arson	5,469	4,178	1,239	52	76.4	22.7	1.1
Forgery and counterfeiting	3,783	2,858	873	52	75.5	23.1	1.3
Fraud	3,421	2,000	1,371	50	58.5	40.1	1.4
Embezzlement	289	245	43	1	84.8	14.9	.3
Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing	18,262	12,084	5,922	256	66.2	32.4	1.4
Vandalism	77,201	62,397	13,683	1,121	80.8	17.7	1.4
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	15,578	8,677	6,525	376	55.7	41.9	3.7
Prostitution and commercialized vice	1,144	450	682	12	39.3	59.6	1.0
Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)	9,595	6,544	2,873	178	68.2	29.9	1.8
Narcotic drug laws	77,504	68,336	7,848	1,320	88.2	10.1	1.6
Gambling	1,941	434	1,452	55	22.4	74.8	3.0
Offenses against family and children	770	660	100	10	85.7	13.0	1.2
Driving under the influence	5,144	4,720	307	117	91.8	6.0	2.2
Liquor laws	74,790	70,400	2,661	1,729	94.1	3.6	2.2
Drunkenness	41,439	34,968	3,973	2,498	84.4	9.6	6.0
Disorderly conduct	123,476	81,807	39,001	2,668	66.3	31.6	2.1
Vagrancy	8,731	6,326	2,118	287	72.5	24.3	3.2
All other offenses (except traffic)	240,787	183,535	53,003	4,249	76.2	22.0	1.8
Suspicion	18,000	14,159	3,764	77	78.7	20.9	.4
Curfew and loitering law violations	97,884	75,665	19,859	2,360	77.3	20.3	2.5
Runaways	186,628	161,614	20,741	4,273	86.6	11.1	2.3

TABLE 106

TOTAL ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971 - CON'T

Offense Charged	Arrests 18 and Over				Percent Distribution		
	Total	White	Negro	All Others	White	Negro	All Others
Total --------------------------	4,702,824	3,232,010	1,302,891	167,923	68.7	27.7	3.5
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	11,255	4,142	6,853	260	36.8	60.9	2.3
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	2,299	1,696	553	50	73.8	24.1	2.1
Forcible rape	11,682	5,754	5,702	226	49.3	48.8	1.9
Robbery	54,220	18,864	34,263	1,093	34.8	63.2	2.0
Aggravated assault	100,538	52,024	46,282	2,232	51.7	46.0	2.1
Burglary-breaking or entering	135,645	85,874	47,213	2,558	63.3	34.8	1.8
Larceny-theft	302,436	198,124	97,813	6,499	65.5	32.3	2.1
Auto theft	53,777	31,491	20,759	1,527	58.6	38.6	2.8
Violent crime	177,695	80,784	93,100	3,811	45.5	52.4	2.0
Property crime	491,858	315,489	165,785	10,584	64.1	33.7	2.2
Subtotal for above offenses	671,852	397,969	259,438	14,445	59.2	38.6	2.1
Other assaults	228,119	140,173	83,757	4,189	61.4	36.7	1.8
Arson	4,404	2,842	1,454	108	64.5	33.0	2.4
Forgery and counterfeiting	35,140	23,629	11,155	356	67.2	31.7	1.0
Fraud	85,958	64,725	20,610	623	75.3	24.0	.7
Embezzlement	5,773	4,259	1,459	55	73.8	25.3	.9
Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing	38,360	23,595	14,181	584	61.5	37.0	1.5
Vandalism	30,582	21,555	8,304	723	70.5	27.2	2.3
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	83,379	38,190	43,557	1,632	45.8	52.2	1.9
Prostitution and commercialized vice	40,363	14,721	25,142	500	36.5	62.3	1.3
Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)	36,835	28,673	7,281	881	77.8	19.8	2.4
Narcotic drug laws	257,393	191,841	62,597	2,955	74.5	24.3	1.2
Gambling	72,084	19,703	49,489	2,892	27.3	68.7	4.0
Offenses against family and childred	50,158	34,511	14,996	651	68.8	29.9	1.3
Driving under the influence	449,285	359,389	78,194	11,702	80.0	17.4	2.6
Liquor laws	131,613	108,890	19,338	3,385	82.7	14.7	2.6
Drunkenness	1,395,520	1,022,061	280,952	95,507	73.2	20.1	6.5
Disorderly conduct	466,641	293,225	158,016	15,400	62.8	33.9	3.3
Vagrancy	50,207	36,215	12,677	1,315	72.1	25.2	2.5
All other offenses (except traffic)	533,974	382,500	139,023	12,451	71.6	26.0	2.3
Suspicion	35,184	23,344	11,271	569	66.3	32.0	1.6
Curfew and loitering law violations							
Runaways							

*Figures in some columns do not add to the total

SOURCE: Data contained in tables were taken entirely from the Uniform Crime Report - 1971. Issued by L. Patrick Gray, III

TABLE 107
TOTAL ARRESTS BY RACE, 1971 - CONT.
(5,610 agencies; 1971 estimated population 146,564,000)

Offense Charged	Total Arrests: Total	Total Arrests: White	Total Arrests: Negro	Total Arrests: All Others	Percent Distribution: White	Percent Distribution: Negro	Percent Distribution: All Others
Tota ----------------------------	6,626,035	4,623,891	1,791,474	210,720	69.8	27.0	3.2
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	13,302	4,716	8,276	310	35.5	62.2	2.4
(b) Manslaughter by negligence	2,698	1,974	626	98	73.2	23.2	3.6
Forcible rape	15,468	7,386	7,781	301	47.8	50.3	1.9
Robbery	83,936	20,524	55,745	1,667	31.6	66.4	1.9
Aggravated assault	126,673	64,502	59,443	2,728	50.9	46.9	2.2
Burglary-breaking or entering	297,147	192,827	98,666	5,654	64.9	33.2	1.9
Larceny-theft	640,421	432,018	195,438	12,965	67.5	30.5	2.0
Auto theft	121,773	75,949	42,596	3,228	62.4	35.0	2.6
Violent crime	239,379	103,128	131,245	5,006	43.1	54.8	2.0
Property crime	1,059,341	700,794	336,700	21,847	66.2	31.8	2.1
Subtotal for above offenses	1,301,418	805,896	468,571	26,951	61.9	36.0	2.1
Other assaults	290,836	174,278	111,128	5,429	59.9	38.2	1.9
Arson	10,638	7,588	2,882	168	71.3	27.1	1.5
Forgery and counterfeiting	41,142	27,848	12,782	422	67.7	31.3	1.0
Fraud	93,095	68,976	23,418	701	74.1	25.2	.8
Embezzlement	6,575	4,914	1,595	66	74.7	24.3	1.0
Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing	61,434	38,582	21,969	883	62.8	35.8	1.4
Vandalism	115,516	90,463	23,153	1,900	78.3	20.0	1.6
Weapons: Carrying, possessing, etc.	105,781	49,650	54,057	2,074	46.9	51.1	2.0
Prostitution and commercialized vice	44,874	16,219	28,132	523	36.1	62.7	1.1
Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)	48,153	36,603	10,477	1,073	76.0	21.8	2.3
Narcotic drug laws	354,783	273,733	76,652	4,398	77.2	21.6	1.2
Gambling	74,911	20,370	51,594	2,947	27.2	68.9	3.9
Offenses against family and children	55,674	38,593	16,384	697	69.3	29.4	1.3
Driving under the influence	480,801	383,106	81,394	16,301	79.7	16.9	3.4
Liquor laws	226,148	196,993	23,747	5,408	87.1	10.5	2.3
Drunkenness	1,472,917	1,085,153	291,335	89,565	73.7	19.8	6.4
Disorderly conduct	606,318	387,620	200,504	18,194	63.9	33.1	3.0
Vagrancy	60,144	43,234	15,285	1,625	71.9	25.4	5.6
All other offenses (except traffic)	837,231	599,289	220,690	17,252	71.6	26.4	2.1
Suspicion	53,184	37,503	15,035	646	70.5	28.3	1.2
Curfew and loitering law violations	97,884	75,665	19,859	2,360	77.3	20.3	2.5
Runaways	186,628	161,614	20,741	4,273	86.6	11.1	2.3

whites, rich and poor, and young and old alike. In an earlier report prepared for a former mayor of Houston (1961), a leading expert in criminology made this statement in reference to Houston:

> As we view our large and rapidly growing metropolis, there is forced upon us the vivid image of a corporate and functional organization of diverse personalities who are obligated to a common system of ordinances, statutory and constitutional laws. Where respect for these standards breaks down, the entire city suffers. It is this quality of human interdependency that makes crime, like disease, a dangerous enemy of man and a malignant tumor which causes rapid deterioration of the social body.

Having viewed statistics on crime for Houston which indicated a disproportionate percentage of blacks involved, Bullock discusses some of the primary causes of this imbalance.

> One of the primary causes of Houston's high total crime and murder rates is areal in nature. It grows out of the tendency for rapid urban expansion to create areal transition out of which crime can thrive and flourish.

To the author, black communities had experienced the kind of uncontrolled urban expansion and deterioration to which he referred.[6]

Crime and violence should not be viewed as a single sociological phenomenon. They embrace many dimensions. For the black community, the more basic causes are seldom raised in public discussions. The basic causes of crime are multifaceted in scope and dimension. For many years we have seen that Houston's rapid areal and functional expansion, uncontrolled by proper planning, has facilitated the development of deteriorating areas in the inner city, particularly in black neighborhoods. These deteriorating areas supply the proper habitat in which criminal behavior can germinate, grow, and flourish. Uncontrolled planning and area instability tend to increase social instability of the areas involved, rendering them highly fluid and tremendously uncertain. Instability is further facilitated by changes in land use which many traditionally stable black communities are now experiencing.

Residential segregation, an ecological phenomenon which has not disappeared from the scene in Houston, contributes to the multifaceted causes of crime.

> Just as unguarded urban expansion has a direct effect in disorganizing the areas, so does it have indirect effect in disorganizing the personalities of the people exposed to it. It is possible for areal instability to set in motion a sociological process which ultimately effects the basic personalities of individuals, rendering them more inclinded to commit crimes of violence or to condone them.

Bullock described this phenomenon this way:

> It aggregates masses of underprivileged people; feeds into their collective psychology certain frustrating forces that lower their collective psychology and certain frustrating forces that lower their threshold for personal irritations; and reinforces the general community's will to treat them differentially.[7]

In essence, residential segregation creates an inclination toward violence and a will to tolerate it.

Other contributory factors which have not been seriously understood as related to black criminality have been the unfavorable attitudes toward law enforcement. Discrimination is still a very serious problem in law enforcement agencies, the courts, and penal institutions. The general public mood exemplified in the acceptable phrase of "law and order" has not surfaced to the point of raising voices against discriminatory practices in the administration of justice. Evidence of certain inequities exists between black and white, and particularly, rich and poor. Attitudinal patterns have become more deeply entrenched by virtue of certain experiences encountered before the "bar of justice." The dual standard concept of law enforcement in our society is seen in the disproportionate number of arrests among blacks, in convictions, in the length of prison sentences, in plea bargaining, and in general relationships involving policemen and black citizens.

PLEA BARGAINING

It has been estimated that 90 percent of the defendants in the criminal justice system are convicted on pleas of guilty rather than by jury trials. Figures for Houston in this regard were not available from the reports we received from the District Attorney's Office. However, we were able to examine figures for Dallas. In Dallas, 90 percent of the defendants chose to plead guilty rather than risk jury trial (Dallas Times Herald, May 31, 1972). The defendant who pleads guilty stands as completely convicted by his own admission as though he has been convicted by a jury. Last year in Dallas, 6,595 offenders were convicted on guilty pleas while 691 were convicted during jury trials. For pleading guilty, the defendant expects more lenient punishment than he might have received by having jury trials. This is not always the case. In addition, there is no way to determine whether the guilty plea is a result of bargaining or actual guilt. Plea bargaining usually occurs if the defendant does not have a lawyer. The so-called "cop-out" man attempts to negotiate a guilty plea with defendants who are too poor or ill-informed to obtain legal counsel. A substantial proportion of those pleading guilty are black. One black defendant, in recalling his encounters with the "cop-out" man, related this incident: "I pleaded guilty because I thought the jury would convict me and give me ten years instead of the six I received. The cop-out man sensed that I knew how tough juries are, especially on ex-cons." In this case, as with many others, punishment was determined during plea bargaining, and pressure tactics are frequently used in such cases. Plea bargaining is more prevalent among black defendants than whites; it takes place with poor people more than rich people. This leads to the question: Can there be equality under law when obvious discrepancies exist in income and class in our society?

Some defense attorneys agree that guilty pleas are a necessary aspect of the criminal justice process, and most strongly object to the cop-out man and plea bargaining with defendants not represented by legal counsel. Criminal District Judges John Mead and James B. Zimmerman of Dallas indicated that they believe the use of the cop-out man is on the way out. Mead believes that there is a movement to begin the plea process before the defendant is indicted (Dallas Times Herald, May 31, 1972). In an interview with District Attorney Henry Wade of Dallas County, it was learned that, in his opinion, "the criminal justice system would break down completely without plea bargaining and guilty pleas." In conjunction with this, Jim Bishop states in his article, "Trial and Error 'Cop-Out' Pleas Cast Shadow on Courts," (Dallas Times Herald, May 31, 1972), that "the American Bar Association has taken the position that plea bargaining is an appropriate form of criminal justice."

There are many additional factors which must be considered when examining the whole question of plea bargaining and its relationship to equity in the judicial process. If an individual is guilty of a crime, plea bargaining is an acceptable way to negotiate punishment; but for those who are not guilty but insecure and afraid, it means denial of equality and justice under the law. Black and poor people comprise the bulk of those making up the criminal population of our various penal institutions. They are more often in jail while awaiting trial because of insufficient funds for bond services or the lack of legal counsel. This stay in jail usually causes loss of jobs, loss of family ties, loss of dignity and self-respect, all of which are cumulative indicators of further instability in the lives of those affected.

ATTITUDINAL FACTORS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Another factor to be considered in analyzing crime in today's society is the attitudes of many citizens toward law enforcement. Indifferent and unfavorable attitudes toward police departments and other law enforcement agencies can lower inhibitions about crime. A particular attitudinal pattern exists in black and other minority communities. It is the sense of self-purification which is used as an excuse for the minority contribution to crime rates. This attitude is more prevalent among lower and lower middle class blacks than middle and upper middle class blacks; it is true for lower class whites as well. This strong inclination toward self-purification results from present and past injustices which they attribute to the dual system of law enforcement; past and current practices of discrimination and segregation. Many individuals employ their segregated status as an explanation for every illegal act committed or any problems which they experience considered counter to acceptable behavior in society.

There is one observation which is never emphasized in reporting black criminality. It is the fact that most law-abiding blacks, of all class levels, are also concerned about increasing crimes of violence in their communities. Most criminal activity among minorities, with few exceptions, represents intra-racial rather than interracial offenses. In the past, law enforcement agencies have been inclined to overlook crimes committed against individuals and property by members of the same race. There is rather convincing evidence that these same officials use a dual standard of law enforcement -- one for blacks; another for whites.

An important attitudinal pattern, involving minority groups, is one which alienates them in the field of law enforcement through the negative images they have developed concerning policemen.

Negative images result from direct contacts with members of police departments. Charges of brutality and foul police practices serve to reinforce negative attitudes toward policemen in Houston. Low income blacks view law enforcement within the framework of their own experiences with members of the police force. In low income communities, policemen are visualized as "gestapo agents," "members of the Ku Klux Klan," "pigs," and as part of the establishment. This kind of image is shaped as a result of altercations which occur with the police. Many altercations take place when persons are arrested on "suspicion" or when they are accused of being drunk. In 1971, forty-four (44%) percent of all persons arrested (over 18 years of age) in Houston for suspicion were black; 35 percent of all persons arrested for vagrancy were black; 33 percent of those arrested for disorderly conduct were black; and 20 percent of those 18 years of age and over arrested for drunkness were black. These types of criminal offenses are those which entail some degree of interpersonal contact or interaction between citizen and law enforcement officials. These interactional contacts are those which breed negative images of policemen by virtue of altercations resulting from such contacts. The workings of the criminal justice system are dependent upon certain discretionary measures and judgments used by policemen who make arrests and define the criminal act. In addition, judgments by policemen are often subjective, reflecting social customs, values, and pressures of the larger society. Positive image building for policemen is directly related to the continuous application of professional judgment and humanistic concern by those charged with apprehending the criminal as well as those involved in prosecuting and passing judgments as to guilt or innocence. The initial point of contact with the accused often shapes the image of law enforcement held by average citizens. Negative images affect effective law enforcement and recruitment.

Police Recruitment and the Black Community

A recent report in the Houston Chronicle (April 8, 1973) indicated that "the percentage of black officers in the Houston Police Department is less today than it was 17 years ago. In 1956, there were 32 blacks on a force of 758, or four percent of the total." Since 1956, civil rights legislation geared toward increasing employment opportunities for blacks and other minorities has been passed, but the percentage has dropped to less than four percent (3.4%), with 73 blacks among the 2,139 member force now in the employment of the Police Department. Even worse is the fact that only two blacks are included in the present 31-cadet training class.

The failure of recruitment efforts or the lack of interest in police training by blacks and other minorities has been attributed to many factors. Inspector H. D. Caldwell, as quoted by the Houston

Chronicle, admitted that efforts at recruitment in Houston have been unsuccessful. Caldwell listed "peer group pressure" by the black community as a possible cause. He was also quoted as saying, "the general consensus here is that the black community simply does not define policing as an acceptable career choice for its young men." Some black leaders interviewed on this same subject tended to disagree. Discriminatory promotional practices and the racist image of the Police Department were listed by some black leaders as blockages to recruitment. Citing low percentages in upper echelon jobs as a basis for these charges, they revealed that of the 239 detectives in the Police Department, only 5 are black. There is no black lieutenant, captain or inspector in the Houston Police Department as of this writing.

It is not surprising that attacks upon police, both physical and verbal, have contributed to the negative image held by the public toward careers in law enforcement. This kind of negativism has affected the policeman's image as a public "savior" and protector and has impaired his general efficiency as an effective police officer. The special and often difficult problems faced by urban police have inhibited rather than enhanced efforts at recruitment.

In connection with the recruitment program, T. C. Sinclair refers to the delicate and sensitive nature of police-community relations and underscores the problem very well with this quote:

> Police in the United States are for the most part white, upwardly mobile lower middle class, conservative in ideology and resistant to change. In most areas in the country, even where segregation has been legally eliminated for long periods, they are likely to grow up without any significant contact with minority and lower socio-economic class life styles -- and certainly with no experience of the realities of ghetto life. They tend to share the attitudes, biases, prejudices of the larger community, among which is likely to be a fear or distrust of Negroes and other minority groups.[8]

It is unfortunate that this type of situation exists, particularly when it is known that the bulk of those incarcerated in jails and penal institutions throughout this country are black or members of other minority groups. Many of these same individuals are products of lower class homes and ghetto environments. The lack of understanding by those charged with the responsibility of enforcing the law can and does impede freedom and justice.

It should be noted that Houston's difficulty in recruiting blacks for police work is not unique. Other cities are experiencing similar difficulties in their recruitment efforts. Dallas and San Antonio report that 3.2 percent of their policemen are black; Fort Worth has three percent; but Galveston has a 14 percent representation of blacks on its police force. In New York, black and Hispanic-American officers total 10 percent; in Los Angeles, blacks make up 5 percent of the force. Atlanta, Georgia is an exception by virtue of action taken to double the number of black policemen on its force. In Atlanta, blacks represent about 22 percent of the force, with blacks comprising about 51 percent of the population for that city as of 1970.

The number of blacks among Texas Highway Patrolmen is also very small. In 1970-71, it was reported that there were 1,347 Texas Highway Patrolmen on duty in the State, with 39 Mexican-Americans and two black patrolmen serving with the Department of Public Safety. A Texas Legislative Council survey (released in 1973) showed 94.7 percent of the Department of Public Safety's workers are white, 3.8 percent of the workers are Chicano, and 1.5 percent are black. Ten of the 2,233 uniformed Department of Public Safety law enforcement personnel are black and 72 are Mexican-American. Department of Public Safety director Wilson E. Spier insists that the department is doing everything it can to encourage more minority group members to apply for jobs with the agency.

FEDERAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SUPPORT

With few exceptions, the criminal justice program formulated and administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) has done little in the way of reducing crime rates in the black community. This opinion corresponds favorably with the findings of a study made for the National Urban Coalition. Four years after Congress authorized funds for LEAA, little has been done to improve the nation's ability to measure or understand the problem of crime. The study made for the Urban Coalition emphasized fundamental points which are not generally known by the public. A major share of the funds for the administration of criminal justice were used for purchases of helicopters, salaries, radio communications systems, and other "hardware." The study also charges that:

> . . . because LEAA has failed to take adequate precautionary steps, its grants are reinforcing the existing discriminatory patterns of the criminal justice system, rather than seeking to eliminate them.

The study further advises:

> . . . LEAA has poured funds into perpetuating the very system it was designed to correct. The new industry emphasizes the combat role of the police. It has alarming potential . . . for the creation of a domestic military apparatus far removed from the traditional, local service-oriented police department.

In many cities and communities throughout Texas and the nation, minority group citizens are complaining that "criminal justice funds are being used to prepare the police for more sophisticated approaches to apprehending members of minority groups;" others charge that the equipment being purchased represents a potential threat to their privacy and security. In line with these perceived ideas, the Urban Coalition study cites repeated purchases of hardware without any prior in-depth analysis of "actual needs, and with no weighing of countervailing individual rights or community values about the proper function of police in a free society."

Other more serious charges brought out in the year-long study were such complaints as accusing the agency (LEAA) of stimulating the development of non-lethal equipment such as "esoteric things as special drugs which, upon injection, immobilize the victims; the "instant cocoon" that releases a plastic spray, creating a tough, plastic membrane; the wire gun that shoots coiled, barbed wire more than 80 feet; sticky substances like "instant banana peel," "instant mud," "instant jungle," -- the latter being a quick-set enveloping gelatin, and other such products.

The non-lethal weapons are purported to be tested by the Army's land warfare laboratories for evaluation. In conjunction with this testing and evaluation, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration made a grant to the Army of a reported $250,000. The emphasis on "hardware" permeates the whole of the criminal justice program which was originally conceived as a program set up to improve the nation's ability to measure and understand the causes of crime; to enhance the delivery of justice through the judicial process. While many persons tended to disagree with some of the findings of the Urban Coalition study, there is evidence that some of the charges have measures of validity.

Texas Criminal Justice Council

Pursuant to Sections 203(a) and 203(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (as amended), the Governor of the State of Texas established by Executive Order of October, 1968, the Criminal Justice Council. This Council was given the responsibility for developing a statewide plan for the improvement of law enforcement throughout the State. Another of its functions was to define, develop, and correlate programs and projects for the State and the units of general local governments, and to combine efforts for improving law enforcement in the State and to establish priorities for improvements.

The basic strategy for upgrading law enforcement personnel involved developing programs which would attract better qualified personnel into police service and developing and implementing programs which would increase the competence of persons already employed by the agencies. A large proportion of the training recommended by the Criminal Justice Council involves professional police education. As of January 1, 1971, eight institutions of higher learning in the state were authorized by the Coordinating Board to grant bachelor degrees in law enforcement. None of these institutions were predominantly black, which poses a question as to whether sincere efforts are being made to recruit and attract blacks and other minorities into law enforcement careers. While some blacks may enroll in such programs at predominantly white institutions such as Sam Houston State University, it is believed that they would be attracted in greater numbers if such courses were offered at some of the predominantly black institutions, even if on a cooperative basis. Texas Southern University, a logical place to provide such course offerings because of its urban location and the rising crime rates among blacks in Houston, does not have such a program. Bishop College of Dallas offers some courses, but these are on a limited basis, and they are primarily for the training of present employees of the Dallas Police Department. In checking statistics on enrollment, none were available for Bishop College. However, it was revealed through inquiries that the enrollment is fewer than 30 persons.

It appears that a logical move in police training and upgrading would be to provide for greater understanding about minority individuals and attitudes. From the data on enrollment, it is quite evident that police officers have few contacts with minority persons even on campuses where they are trained. Experimental and innovative teaching projects, void of substantial minority group contacts and enrollment, are ineffective from their inception by virtue of their failures to come to grips with basic problems of understanding the subjects with which they have to deal. Unfortunately, predominantly black schools and black consultants have been overlooked or utilized minimally in the total plans of criminal justice programs and in the allocation of funds by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. An examination of programs, handled through Council of Governments in Texas, will reveal that Texas is no exception to this practice. Of all Texas schools participating in Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) few, if any, are predominantly black or have predominantly black enrollments in any of the majors or curriculum courses offered. The following Table 108 shows LEEP participating colleges and universities as of July 1, 1971. Data since that time reveal little improvement in the situation.

Table 108
Texas Schools Participating in LEEP With Law Enforcement Enrollment and Majors
July 1, 1971

	Total LE Program Enrollment	Law Enforcement Majors	Law Enforcement Majors Fall, 1971
Alvin Jr. College	60	28	56
Amarillo College	53	53	72
Bishop College	*	*	*
Brazosport Jr. College District	*	*	*
Central Texas College - Killeen and Austin	252	216	220 + 125 (Killeen)
Christian College of the S.W.	150	*	276
College of the Mainland	19	17	33
Cooke County Jr. College	75	49	55
Dallas Baptist College			40
Del Mar College	95	91	107
East Texas State University	*	*	*
El Centro College	262	310	190
Galveston County Jr. College	74	0	37
Grayson Jr. College	67	67	60
Hardin - Simmons University	106	104	128
Henderson County Jr. College	150	85	50
Howard County Jr. College	28	23	20
Kilgore College	75	75	86
Lamar University	161	55	64 (AA)
Lee College	30	30	34
Laredo Jr. College	11	11	23
Mary Hardin - Baylor College	*	*	*
McLennan County College	72	61	79
Midwestern University	*	*	*
North Texas State University			*
Odessa College	180	51	99
Prairie View A&M College			*
Sam Houston State University	1,103	733	879
San Antonio Union J.C. District	608	608	*
San Jacinto College	59	24	50
South Texas Jr. College	118	107	103
Southwest Texas State University	568	178	253
St. Edward's University	*	*	*
St. Mary's University	*	*	29
Stephen F. Austin St. College	*	*	*
Tarrant Co. Jr. College	260	255	300
Texarkana College	75	75	77
Texas A&I University	14	14	*
Texas Christian University	25	25	23
Texas Wesleyan College	*	*	*
Tyler Jr. College	73	58	50
University of Texas at Arlington	333	53	60
University of Texas at Austin	*	*	*
University of Texas at El Paso	*	*	*
University of Houston	*	*	*
Victoria Jr. College	77	33	30
Wharton County Jr. College	*	*	*
Total	5,233	3,587	

Source: Criminal Justice Plan For Texas, 1972 and 1973
Austin, Texas, Criminal Justice Council.

Funds spent for criminal justice programs in Texas reflect efforts toward "hardware" as well as humanistic and preventive measures in law enforcement. Various cities, including Dallas and Houston, have spent considerable sums of money on professionalizing its police, on riot control equipment, computerized services, information data depository system, crime laboratory services, and funds to improve the neural network of police departments -- a means by which they get information, make decisions, and react to criminal activity. This is the command, control, and communications system. Programs to improve the quality of police performance, particularly in the minority communities, and plans to explore more effective means of preventing crimes are generally lacking in black communities throughout the State. The programs funded deviate little from the traditional techniques utilized among juveniles, for instance. For the most part, blacks have not been totally involved in planning for the reduction of crime in their communities. These statements represent a variety of opinions secured in unstructured interviews with leading black citizens in Houston and parts of Texas. Clyde Owens Jackson, past editor of the Houston Informer and superintendent of the South Park Post Office, had this to say concerning training of policemen:

> Examinations by which Houston policemen are promoted should be revised to show 'leadership ability' rather than knowledge of police department matters and procedures... Just because a man can read a book and give back what it contains doesn't mean he is qualified to be a supervisor.

He suggested that the Mayor of Houston appoint a multi-racial committee to draw up a new Civil Service law for Houston.

Crime prevention appears to be the point at which programs to improve justice and the enforcement of order in the society must begin. In the past, criminal justice -- in some cases -- has concerned itself with crime detection and apprehension rather than preventive measures. This is evident in the earlier works of academic scholars. Charges have been made against the LEAA which tend to suggest that funds from this agency have been directed toward developing more effective means of dealing most directly and most swiftly with the poor and minorities, especially blacks. This is what is termed in non-academic circles as the "riot and violence syndrome" which has saturated program planning and administration of some local police departments and state law enforcement agencies.

Proposed methods for strengthening the effect of law enforcement in our society -- indeed, in Houston and Texas -- must necessarily include reordering priorities to include a firm commitment to strengthen community-based treatment programs, including probation, work release programs, youth service bureaus, parole and aftercare. Law enforcement must also include enforcing laws swiftly, certainly, and equitably. Attention focused in these directions would enhance greater respect for law, order, and justice in the society. To be sure, respect for law in the society is basic to any successful crime prevention program.

What is needed, and needed promptly, is an agency independent of political and traditional institutional constraints generously funded with basic authority. This authority would entail the commitment to provide essential legal representation for the poor; to foster a sense of confidence not only in the court system but in the police department as well. Such an agency would seek the cooperation of black and white educators alike in a program with facilities for on-going research in prevention and legal reform. If concerns for prevention, adequate legal representation, swift but equitable punishment for the guilty were made priorities, an improved criminal justice system would virtually be assured.

BLACK LAWYERS

Not only are minority groups poorly represented in the area of law enforcement, they are also noticeably poorly represented in the court system. Black lawyers constitute less than one percent of the legal profession. Although there are more blacks than ever before in law schools throughout the country, they are still few in number. The main obstacle that now confronts the new black law school graduates is the state bar examinations that all graduates must pass in order to begin practicing law.

The bar examination, in theory, is used presumably to test legal proficiency. In an article in Essence magazine (April, 1973), Lynn Walker points out that the bar examination:

> . . . may be drawn up by persons who have no particular expertise in the testing area; they may be

> slanted toward certain types of subject matter to the virtual exclusion of others; they may be basically memory tests to see if the applicant can master nuances of local law.

Walker feels that most important, there is no indication that these examinations indicate proficiency in one's ability to be a lawyer.

For instance, in Alabama where the population is 25 percent black, there are only 28 practicing black attorneys out of a total of 3,410 attorneys. This means that only .008 percent of the black population in Alabama is represented in the legal profession.

In Pennsylvania, while 98 percent of all those taking the exam eventually pass, only 70 percent of the blacks pass. Between 1933 and 1943, no blacks were admitted to the bar. There are 10 million blacks in Pennsylvania, but only 130 black attorneys out of the total 12,300 lawyers.

In Delaware, no blacks have passed the bar since 1959 -- a period of fourteen years! Suits alleging racial discrimination in bar admission have been filed in Alabama, Virginia, South Carolina, Ohio, California, Georgia and Maryland. Some of these suits alleged that bar examiners have been able to identify applicants by race in grading tests, because applicants are required to send in their photograph, a description of their educational background and character. In addition, part of the action in the impending lawsuits is to obtain rights to obtain the law examinations as evidence of discrimination. Most are destroyed after grading. This way there has been no evidence for blacks to use in challenging the decision.

The determinations of bar examiners are finally under scrutiny. It is unconceivable that there are so many black law students who have failed to pass the bar exam (in proportion to whites) without racial discrimination being a factor in these failures.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Jerome H. Skolnick, et al., Crisis in American Institutions. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, (1972)), pp. 387-88.

[2] Ibid.

[3] John H. McNamara, "Uncertainties in Police Work: 'The Relevance of Police Recruits' Background and Training," in Ibid.; and Niederhoffer, Behind the Shield: The Police in Urban Society, in Ibid., pp. 388-89.

[4] Henry Allen Bullock, "Significance of the Racial Factor in the Assessment of Prison Sentences," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 52, No. 4 (November-December, 1961), pp. 411-17.

[5] The Negro Yearbook, (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, (1966)).

[6] Henry Allen Bullock, "The Houston Murder Problem: Its Nature, Apparent Causes and Probable Cures," A Report Prepared for the Mayor's Office, City of Houston, June, 1961.

[7] Ibid.

[8] T. C. Sinclair, "Law and Order Reconsidered," in The Criminal Justice System in Texas, A Report Prepared for the Texas Urban Development Commission, 1971.

CHAPTER 7

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: MINORITY BUSINESSES

A profile of the economic characteristics, attitudes, and problems of minority business entrepreneurs in Houston was compiled by the Small Business Development Center of Texas Southern University.[1] Without comment, the entire data obtained from the survey are given in this section in slightly abbreviated form. Information on the major types of business activities, by types of retail and service firms, and, by the racial background of the owners is included.

As a matter of summary, of the six hundred eighty-six (686) firms surveyed, forty-seven, or 6.9 percent, of the firms had gone out of business, with less than three percent relocating outside of the Model Neighborhood Area. Approximately 7 percent of the business enterprises had failed between the time of their identification in late March and the time of survey contact in July, 1972. It should be noted that this should not be construed as meaning that firms in Model Neighborhood Areas are failing since no efforts were made to determine the number of new firms entering the area. However, figures do indicate that there is a large turnover in businesses in Model Neighborhood Areas as well as in other areas of the city where small business enterpreneurs have chosen to locate. This fact is further amplified when the failures are combined with those for firms which relocated elsewhere -- outside of the Model Neighborhood Area. The combined figures, according to the report released by the Small Business Development Center, indicate an approximate decrease of 9.2 percent in the number of firms operating within the MNA during the period from March through July, offset, "as mentioned" by the unknown number of new ventures started and the relocations into the MNA during the same period.

---

[1] Appreciation is expressed to Dr. L. B. Bickman, Dr. L. Sardana and members of the Small Business Development Center for permission to use a portion of the materials included in the survey. The complete report and deck cards giving the survey results by four digit SIC codes are available from the Small Business Development Center in Texas Southern University.

The data included in this section provide some insight into the problems which confront businesses located in the general survey area. Economic characteristics are deliberately emphasized, and some attitudes expressed by owners of business in Model Neighborhood Areas have also been condensed and included in tabular form.

Table 109

Employment Data for Small Business Establishments in Houston

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Number of Black Employees . . .				
None	.6	87.5	41.2	23.1
1-3	62.3	12.5	43.3	42.9
4-6	24.6	----	5.2	11.0
7-9	8.4	----	2.1	6.6
10-12	1.8	----	2.1	5.5
13-15	.6	----	1.0	1.1
16-19	1.2	----	----	----
20 or more	.6	----	5.2	8.8
No answer	----	----	----	1.1
Number of Mexican-American Employees . . .				
None	98.2	12.5	70.1	50.5
1-3	1.8	75.0	19.6	24.2
4-6	----	6.3	4.1	11.0
7-9	----	6.3	1.0	2.2
10-12	----	----	2.1	5.5
13-15	----	----	2.1	1.1
16-19	----	----	----	----
20 or more	----	----	1.0	3.3
No answer	----	----	----	2.2
Number of White Employees . . .				
None	98.2	93.8	10.3	25.3
1-3	1.2	6.3	60.8	23.1
4-6	.6	----	12.4	12.1
7-9	----	----	5.2	6.6
10-12	----	----	3.1	11.0
13-15	----	----	4.1	3.3
16-19	----	----	1.0	----
20 or more	----	----	3.1	16.5
No answer	----	----	----	2.2
Base (Number of Employees)	613	35	1365	2207
Share of total classified as . . .				
White	1.3	2.9	63.2	51.3
Black	98.0	5.7	27.3	35.8
Mexican-American	.5	91.4	9.5	12.2
Other	.2	----	----	.7

Table 110
Information on Location of Business Establishments

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Has been in business at present location . . .				
Less than one year	4.2	----	----	3.3
1-2 years	14.4	25.0	9.3	22.0
3-4 years	13.8	12.5	10.3	13.2
5-9 years	27.5	31.3	13.4	20.9
10-14 years	13.2	18.8	17.5	12.1
15-19 years	11.4	----	9.3	8.8
20-29 years	12.6	12.5	19.6	4.4
30 or more years	3.0	----	18.6	9.9
No answer	----	----	2.1	5.5
* * * * Average years this location	10.17	8.38	16.67	10.92
Total years in business . . .				
Less than one	3.6	----	----	1.1
1-2 years	8.4	12.5	3.1	12.1
3-4 years	11.4	6.3	6.2	7.7
5-9 years	20.4	25.0	8.2	11.0
10-14 years	15.0	31.3	15.5	12.1
15-19 years	13.2	6.3	11.3	7.7
20-29 years	18.6	12.5	25.8	16.5
30 or more years	6.6	----	27.8	22.0
No answer	3.0	6.3	2.1	9.9
* * * * Average years in business	13.32	10.27	22.06	20.18
Number of previous locations . . .				
None	63.5	68.8	59.2	41.8
One	26.3	18.8	27.8	39.6
Two	6.0	12.5	7.2	8.8
Three	.6	----	1.0	----
Four	----	----	----	----
Five or more	----	----	----	----
No answer	3.6	----	4.1	9.9
Satisfaction with present location . . .				
Wouldn't move under any circumstances	49.7	62.5	58.8	52.7
Might consider moving	25.7	12.5	28.9	19.6
Would move if could afford to	18.0	18.7	1.0	7.7
Am definitely considering a move	3.6	6.3	5.1	11.0
Other answers	1.2	----	2.1	4.4
No answers	1.8	----	4.1	4.4

Table 111

Marketing Area and Consumer Problems

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Consider firm's market area to be. . .				
Above average	55.1	56.3	54.6	61.5
Smaller compared to other firms	29.3	37.5	28.9	15.4
Larger compared to other firms	14.4	6.2	14.4	19.8
No answer	1.2	----	2.1	3.3
Base (Numbered larger)	24	1	14	18
Market area is larger because. . .				
Market area beyond neighborhood	20.8	----	35.7	33.3
Well established/Known	16.7	----	21.4	22.2
Good location	8.3	100.0	7.1	22.2
Good product/Service	16.7	----	14.3	----
Good assets(Stock/Plant/Equipment)	8.3	----	7.1	11.1
Effective personnel	8.3	----	----	----
Business trends good	4.2	----	----	----
All other answers	20.8	----	21.4	11.1
No answer	----	----	----	5.6
Base (Number smaller)	49	6	28	14
Market area is smaller because. . .				
Inadequate capital/Equipment/Stock	14.3	66.7	25.0	21.4
Poor location	10.2	----	21.4	21.4
Limited area/Low economic clintele	16.3	16.7	----	28.6
New/Unknown	8.2	----	17.9	14.3
Business trend bad	8.2	----	10.7	----
Personnel problems	4.1	----	----	7.1
Personal - Health/Age/Laziness	4.1	----	3.6	----
All other answers	28.6	33.3	17.9	14.3
No answer	10.2	----	7.1	7.1

Table 112

Communities Served by Small Businesses in Houston According to Race of Owner

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Geographical locations				
Third Ward	53.3	12.5	21.6	18.7
Citywide	11.4	----	24.7	31.9
Heights & North Houston	4.2	18.8	13.4	9.9
Fifth Ward	13.8	6.3	6.2	1.1
Riverside	15.0	----	4.1	2.2
Sunnyside/Foster	17.4	----	----	----
State/National	1.8	----	7.2	18.7
Fourth Ward	5.4	12.5	9.3	4.4
Southpark/Crestmont	12.6	----	----	1.1
Near Southwest	2.4	6.3	6.2	4.4
Second Ward	----	37.5	4.1	2.2
Area 6	1.8	12.5	4.1	3.3
Acres Homes & Aldine	6.0	----	1.0	1.1
Springbranch/Memorial/Katy Freeway	1.8	----	4.1	2.2
Area 7	1.8	----	4.1	1.1
Ryon's Addition	1.2	12.5	3.1	1.1
Denver Harbor	3.0	----	2.1	----
Downtown	1.2	----	1.0	2.2
Kashmere Gardens	2.4	----	1.0	----
Middle Southwest	1.8	----	----	1.1
Far Southwest	----	----	1.0	2.2
All other answers	.6	----	6.2	1.1
No answer	7.2	12.5	11.3	7.7

Table 113
Principal Competitors of Businesses According to Race of Owner

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base	167	16	97	91
(Number of Principal Competitors)				
None	15.0	12.5	16.6	8.9
One	19.2	----	25.0	13.3
Two	27.5	31.2	21.9	18.9
Three	20.3	43.7	17.7	27.8
Four	9.0	6.3	4.2	11.1
Five or more	.6	6.3	----	1.1
No answer/Don't know/Refused	8.4	----	14.6	18.9

Table 114
Environmental Factors of Business Places

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	157	16	97	91
Is property converted residential?				
Yes	25.7	12.5	15.5	6.6
No	73.1	81.3	83.5	91.2
What is the appearance of the building?				
Good	48.5	37.5	38.1	75.8
Fair	38.9	43.8	37.1	15.4
Poor	12.0	18.8	24.7	6.6
Has the maintenance of the building been. . .				
Good	53.3	37.5	39.2	69.2
Fair	37.1	50.0	35.1	24.2
Poor	9.0	12.5	25.8	4.4
What is appearance of interior of store?				
Good	49.7	37.5	41.2	73.6
Fair	39.5	50.0	34.0	19.8
Poor	9.6	12.5	23.7	5.5

Table 115

Educational Attainment and Business Ownership by Race, 1972

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Education attainment of owner . . .				
Less than 8 yrs. of school	5.4	25.0	5.2	1.1
8 yrs. of elementary	3.6	6.3	9.3	2.2
Some high school	18.6	37.5	9.3	3.3
Graduated high school	16.2	25.0	33.0	----
Business or trade school	19.8	----	4.1	1.1
Some college	25.7	----	19.6	1.1
Graduated college	9.6	----	14.4	1.1
Some graduate work	2.4	----	1.0	1.1
Other	3.0	----	1.0	----
Respondent does not know owner	----	----	----	37.4
No answer	----	6.3	5.2	51.6

Table 116

Types of Advertising Media Used by Small Business Owners

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Types of advertising media use . . .				
Yellow pages	42.5	25.0	47.4	70.3
Calendars, ink pens	19.2	25.0	17.5	24.2
Signs (Billboards, posters)	16.2	----	19.6	23.1
Printed circulars	13.2	6.3	9.3	19.8
Direct mail	7.2	----	13.4	25.3
Major newspapers	10.8	----	10.3	22.0
Suburban newspapers	12.0	6.3	8.2	13.2
Radio	11.4	6.3	3.1	13.2
Trading stamps or coupons	12.0	12.5	1.0	4.4
Television	1.8	----	1.0	13.2
Other answers	12.6	----	12.4	18.7
None of above	21.6	43.8	29.9	17.6

Table 115
Educational Attainment and Business Ownership by Race, 1972

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Education attainment of owner . . .				
Less than 8 yrs. of school	5.4	25.0	5.2	1.1
8 yrs. of elementary	3.6	6.3	9.3	2.2
Some high school	18.6	37.5	9.3	3.3
Graduated high school	16.2	25.0	33.0	----
Business or trade school	19.8	----	4.1	1.1
Some college	25.7	----	19.6	1.1
Graduated college	9.6	----	14.4	1.1
Some graduate work	2.4	----	1.0	1.1
Other	3.0	----	1.0	----
Respondent does not know owner	----	----	----	37.4
No answer	----	6.3	5.2	51.6

Table 116
Types of Advertising Media Used by Small Business Owners

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Types of advertising media use . . .				
Yellow pages	42.5	25.0	47.4	70.3
Calendars, ink pens	19.2	25.0	17.5	24.2
Signs (Billboards, posters)	16.2	----	19.6	23.1
Printed circulars	13.2	6.3	9.3	19.8
Direct mail	7.2	----	13.4	25.3
Major newspapers	10.8	----	10.3	22.0
Suburban newspapers	12.0	6.3	8.2	13.2
Radio	11.4	6.3	3.1	13.2
Trading stamps or coupons	12.0	12.5	1.0	4.4
Television	1.8	----	1.0	13.2
Other answers	12.6	----	12.4	18.7
None of above	21.6	43.8	29.9	17.6

Table 117

Residential Data and Ownership

	OWNER OF BUSINESS			
	Black	Mexican-American	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of firms)	167	16	97	91
Geographical locations				
Third Ward	40.2	18.7	4.3	3.2
Heights & North Houston	1.6	18.7	21.5	1.1
Sunnyside/Foster	10.9	6.2	2.1	1.1
Southpark/Crestmont	9.8	----	2.1	----
Springbranch/Memorial/Katy Freeway	9.8	----	2.2	----
Riverside	6.5	----	1.1	----
Middle Southwest	1.1	----	7.5	3.3
Fifth Ward	3.8	6.2	1.1	----
Near Southwest	.6	----	7.5	----
Second Ward	.5	25.0	1.1	1.1
Denver Harbor	3.3	----	----	----
Kashmere Gardens	2.2	----	1.1	----
Acres Homes & Aldine	1.1	----	3.2	----
Ryon's Addition	.5	6.3	3.2	----
Far Southwest	----	6.3	4.3	----
Fourth Ward	.5	----	1.1	----
Pasadena/City of South Houston	----	----	2.2	----
Settegast/Scenic Woods	.5	----	----	----
All other answers	3.8	6.3	17.2	----
No answer	3.3	6.3	17.2	90.2

Table 11P

PERCENTAGE OF FIRMS BY TYPE OF BUSINESS WITH SPECIFIED PERCENTAGE OF CUSTOMERS RESIDING WITHIN TEN BLOCKS OF THE FIRM

	Type of Business				
	Manufacturing	Wholesale	Retail	Service	Other
Base (Number of Firms)	28	26	180	112	25
Share of Sales to Customers Living Within 10 Blocks of Firm....					
None	51.7	53.8	3.4	10.7	24.0
1-10 Percent	31.0	34.6	15.1	26.8	28.0
11-19 Percent	-	3.8	2.2	3.6	8.0
20-29 Percent	-	-	9.5	8.9	8.0
30-39 Percent	-	-	2.8	4.4	-
40-49 Percent	-	-	3.4	3.6	-
50-59 Percent	-	-	11.7	8.0	4.0
60-69 Percent	-	-	3.9	1.8	-
70-79 Percent	-	-	10.6	3.6	8.0
80-89 Percent	-	-	8.4	2.7	4.0
90-99 Percent	-	-	8.4	4.5	-
All--100 Percent	-	-	7.8	6.2	-
No Answer/Don't Know	17.3	3.9	12.8	15.2	16.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Percentage Reported	1.00	5.80	50.03	31.98	18.71

Table 119

PERCENTAGE OF CERTAIN RETAIL AND SERVICE FIRMS WITH SPECIFIED PERCENTAGE OF CUSTOMERS RESIDING WITHIN TEN BLOCKS OF THE FIRM

	Gas Station	Eating Places	Drink Places	Liquor Stores	Beauty Shops	Barber Shops	Auto Repair	Misc. Repair
Base (Number of Firms)	18	28	25	13	22	16	17	10
Share of Sales To Customers Living Within 10 Blocks of Firm								
None	-	-	4.0	-	4.5	-	23.5	30.0
1-10 Percent	22.2	7.1	8.0	-	13.6	43.7	23.5	30.0
11-19 Percent	5.5	-	-	-	4.5	-	5.9	-
20-29 Percent	5.5	21.4	12.0	7.7	13.6	6.2	5.9	-
30-39 Percent	-	-	4.0	-	4.6	6.2	5.9	10.0
40-49 Percent	16.7	-	4.0	-	9.1	6.2	5.9	-
50-59 Percent	5.6	7.1	16.0	23.0	13.6	6.3	11.7	-
60-69 Percent	-	7.2	8.0	7.7	4.6	-	-	-
70-79 Percent	11.1	21.4	4.0	15.4	4.6	6.3	-	-
80-89 Percent	16.7	-	4.0	7.7	-	6.3	-	-
90-99 Percent	11.1	10.7	4.0	15.4	-	-	5.9	-
All--100 Percent	-	7.2	16.0	15.4	4.6	6.3	5.9	-
No Answer/Don't Know	5.6	17.9	16.0	7.7	22.7	12.5	5.9	30.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Percentage Reported	47.82	55.09	53.14	70.67	34.41	32.14	26.56	6.29

Table 120

LENGTH OF TIME AT PRESENT LOCATION AND LENGTH OF LIFE BY TYPE OF BUSINESS AND BY ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS OF OWNER

		Type of Business					Owner of Business			
	Total	Manufacturing	Wholesale	Retail	Service	Other	Black	Mex. Amer.	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of Firms)	371	28	26	180	112	25	167	16	97	91
Has Been in Business at Present Location										
Less Than 1 Yr.	2.7	-	3.8	4.4	.9	-	4.2	-	-	3.3
1-2 Years	15.4	17.9	23.1	18.9	8.0	12.0	14.4	25.0	9.3	22.0
3-4 Years	12.7	14.3	11.5	13.9	9.8	16.0	13.8	12.5	10.3	13.2
5-9 Years	22.4	3.6	26.9	22.2	26.8	20.0	27.5	31.3	13.4	20.9
10-14 Years	14.3	10.7	7.7	12.2	18.8	20.0	13.2	18.8	17.5	12.1
15-19 Years	9.7	3.6	7.7	7.8	15.2	8.0	11.4	-	9.3	8.8
20-29 Years	12.4	10.7	7.7	12.2	15.2	8.0	12.6	12.5	19.6	4.4
30 or More Years	8.6	39.3	11.5	6.1	3.6	12.0	3.0	-	18.6	9.9
No Answer	1.9	-	-	2.2	1.8	4.0	-	-	2.1	5.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Years This Location	11.96	23.64	11.42	10.07	12.08	12.29	10.17	8.38	16.67	10.92
Total Yrs. in Bus.										
Less Than 1 Yr.	1.9	-	-	3.3	-	4.0	3.6	-	-	1.1
1-2 Years	8.1	10.7	11.5	11.1	2.7	4.0	8.4	12.5	3.1	12.1
3-4 Years	8.9	7.1	3.8	10.6	8.0	8.0	11.4	6.3	6.2	7.7
5-9 Years	15.1	-	11.5	17.8	16.1	12.0	20.4	25.0	8.2	11.0
10-14 Years	15.1	14.3	11.5	14.4	17.9	12.0	15.0	31.3	15.5	12.1
15-19 Years	11.1	-	11.5	8.9	17.9	8.0	13.2	6.3	11.3	7.7
20-29 Years	19.7	21.4	26.9	18.3	18.8	24.0	18.6	12.5	25.8	16.5
30 or More Years	15.6	46.4	23.1	9.4	14.3	24.0	6.6	-	27.8	22.0
No Answer	4.6	-	-	6.1	4.5	4.0	3.0	6.3	2.1	9.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Years in Business	17.13	33.89	20.92	13.20	16.95	21.92	13.32	10.27	22.06	20.18

Table 121
LENGTH OF TIME AT PRESENT LOCATION AND LENGTH OF LIFE FOR CERTAIN RETAIL AND SERVICE FIRMS

	Gas Stations	Eating Places	Drink Places	Liquor Stores	Beauty Shops	Barber Shops	Auto Repair	Misc. Repair
Base (Number of Firms)	18	28	25	13	22	16	17	10
Has Been in Business at Present Location								
Less Than 1 Yr.	11.1	3.6	4.0	-	4.5	-	-	-
1-2 Years	11.1	14.3	24.0	23.1	4.5	-	17.6	20.0
3-4 Years	16.7	21.4	16.0	7.7	13.6	18.8	-	30.0
5-9 Years	11.1	21.4	24.0	15.4	22.7	37.5	23.5	20.0
10-14 Years	5.6	21.4	16.0	7.7	31.8	6.3	11.8	-
15-19 Years	16.7	3.6	-	7.7	22.7	6.3	17.6	20.0
20-29 Years	11.1	14.3	12.0	23.1	-	31.3	17.6	10.0
30 or More Yrs.	5.6	-	4.0	7.7	-	-	11.8	-
No Answer	11.1	-	-	7.7	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Years This Location	10.56	8.61	8.56	13.42	9.41	11.94	14.29	8.90
Total Years in Business....								
Less Than 1 Yr.	11.1	-	4.0	-	-	-	-	-
1-2 Years	11.1	7.1	20.0	7.7	-	-	5.9	-
3-4 Years	11.1	14.3	16.0	7.7	9.1	12.5	5.9	30.0
5-9 Years	11.1	28.6	20.0	15.4	9.1	18.8	17.6	20.0
10-14 Years	5.6	28.6	12.0	23.1	40.9	6.3	17.6	-
15-19 Years	11.1	3.6	8.0	7.7	27.3	12.5	11.8	20.0
20-29 Years	11.1	17.9	16.0	15.4	4.5	43.8	5.9	20.0
30 or More Yrs.	5.6	-	4.0	15.4	4.5	6.3	29.4	10.0
No Answer	22.2	-	-	7.7	4.5	-	5.9	-
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Years In Business	10.29	10.79	10.12	15.25	14.52	16.88	18.25	13.10

Table 122

OWNERSHIP AND MONTHLY RENTALS BY TYPE OF BUSINESS AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OWNER

		Type of Business					Owner of Business			
	Total	Manufacturing	Whole-Sale	Retail	Service	Other	Black	Mex. Amer.	White	Other Dk/Nr
Base (Number of Firms)	371	28	26	180	112	25	167	16	97	91
Monthly Rental of Building...										
None--Own Bldg.	36.8	61.5	48.0	29.2	37.9	50.0	32.5	25.0	39.3	44.3
Less Than $25	.3	-	-	-	.9	-	.6	-	-	-
$25-$49	2.2	-	-	2.8	2.7	-	4.2	-	1.0	-
$50-$74	6.0	3.8	-	3.9	12.6	-	9.6	12.5	4.2	-
$75-$99	6.3	-	4.0	2.8	12.6	12.5	9.7	6.2	5.3	1.1
$100-$124	9.1	-	-	12.9	9.0	-	13.3	25.0	3.2	4.5
$124-$149	7.4	3.8	4.0	11.2	3.6	4.1	9.1	25.0	6.4	2.3
$150-$174	5.5	3.8	4.0	6.8	5.4	-	6.6	-	6.4	3.4
$175-$199	1.9	-	-	3.4	.9	-	3.0	-	1.1	1.1
$200-$299	5.5	3.9	4.0	8.4	1.8	4.2	4.2	-	9.6	4.6
$300-$399	2.8	3.9	4.0	2.3	2.7	4.2	.6	-	6.4	3.4
$400-$499	3.0	3.9	16.0	3.4	-	-	2.4	-	3.2	4.6
$500-$999	.6	-	4.0	-	.9	-	-	-	-	2.3
$1,000 or More	1.1	-	-	1.1	-	8.3	-	-	1.1	3.4
No Answer	11.5	15.4	12.0	11.8	9.0	16.7	4.2	6.3	12.8	25.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Monthly Rent Reported	220.11	219.38	369.73	207.02	124.82	828.89	128.32	100.00	211.73	601.90

Table 123

OWNERSHIP AND MONTHLY RENTALS FOR CERTAIN RETAIL AND SERVICE FIRMS

	Gas Stations	Eating Places	Drink Places	Liquor Stores	Beauty Shops	Barber Shops	Auto Repair	Misc. Repair
Base (Number of Firms)	18	28	25	13	22	16	17	10
Monthly Rental of Building....								
None--Own Building	33.3	35.7	12.5	30.7	23.8	18.7	35.3	50.0
Less Than $25	-	-	-	-	4.8	-	-	-
$25-$49	-	-	4.1	-	9.5	-	-	-
$50-$74	-	-	4.1	15.4	19.0	25.0	5.9	30.0
$75-$99	-	7.1	4.2	7.7	23.8	25.0	5.9	-
$100-$124	16.7	10.7	12.5	15.4	4.8	12.5	5.9	10.0
$124-$149	5.5	7.1	29.2	15.4	9.5	-	5.9	-
$150-$174	5.5	7.1	12.5	7.7	-	6.2	11.7	10.0
$175-$199	-	7.1	4.2	-	-	6.3	-	-
$200-$299	5.6	7.2	4.2	-	-	-	-	-
$300-$399	5.6	3.6	-	-	-	-	11.7	-
$400-$499	-	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
$500-$999	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.9	-
$1,000 or More	-	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Answer	27.8	7.2	12.5	7.7	4.8	6.3	11.8	-
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Monthly Rent Reported	172.43	408.50	146.32	100.00	101.69	92.58	232.22	85.00

CHAPTER 8

THE PROGRESS OF CIVIL RIGHTS

In brief, a comparative thread between black, white, and brown citizens has colored the presentation of data in this document. We have indexed neatly into paragraphs and statistical tables a miscellany of facts which convey details on the problems and accomplishments of minority citizens in Houston and parts of Harris County. It should be emphasized that limited data have been included on the Mexican-American population. This limitation is due to a lack of available information or it is due to the fact that statistics on brown citizens were combined with those of other races, thus making a clear delineation of the data difficult, if not impossible, to discern.

Previous statements and information provide adequate accounts of inequities which still exist in areas of housing, education, employment, income, and related areas. These gaps exist despite the crescendo of legal victories against discriminatory practices. In a rational sense, the reason is that discrimination, caused by more than three centuries of abuse, segregation, and bias, will not automatically disappear. Another view is that evasions, non-compliance, and outright acts of defiance are symptoms of problems which just do not seem to go away. Both viewpoints or positions have validity. To be sure, there is need for deliberate and continuous planning and commitment if we are to minimize and eventually resolve the problems with which minority groups are faced.

There is evidence to suggest that some progress has been made in the direction of achieving the goals of equal opportunity for minority group citizens in Houston. The extent of this progress has not been adequately assessed. The remaining portion of this report reviews some of the events which sparked the movement outlawing discrimination in American society and relates the accomplishments made in Houston during the past decades.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

A casual review of civil rights activities in this country points toward two fundamental factors as the main explanations for the progress made to date. First, there was a commitment to equal justice and equal opportunity by the national administrations. This commitment was characterized by a strong and vigorous drive for the passage of legislation which would outlaw segregation and discrimination in almost every aspect of American society. The other factor related to the nature and kind of leadership during the critical years following the 1954 Court decree. During the Kennedy-Johnson years, there was a national posture which demonstrated a legal and moral dedication to end discrimination in the United States. These two factors, coupled with the awareness and mood of the public concerning inequality, provided the necessary impetus for movement away from the dual structure into a more open society.

The late President Lyndon B. Johnson lamented about human rights and equal justice for all Americans in his book, My Hope for America (New York: Random House, 1964). In discussing the Civil Rights Act, he wrote: "The Civil Rights Act is a challenge to men of goodwill to transform the commands of our land into the customs of our land." Subsequent statements by President Johnson shed greater light on the challenge of justice in this country. The rationale which directed the passage of civil rights legislation during the Kennedy-Johnson years is set forth in numerous statements made during the course of these administrations. Johnson explains,

> The purpose of the law is simple. It does not restrict the freedom of any American so long as he respects the rights of others. It does not give special treatment to any citizen. It does say that those who are equal before God shall also be equal in the polling booths, in the classrooms, in the factories, and in hotels, restaurants, movie theaters, and other places that provide service to the public . . .

Explaining further, he states,

> Its purpose is not to punish . . . not to divide, but to end divisions -- divisions which have lasted too long. Its purpose is national not regional. Its purpose is to promote a more abiding commitment to freedom, a more constant pursuit of justice, and a deeper respect for human dignity.

Americans shared mixed feelings of pride and anxiety about the social changes which occurred as a result of the legal abolishment of segregation. Part of the anxiety which resulted stemmed from the gap between the ideological foundation of democracy and actual practices in the society. Today, we find that some anxieties and negative attitudes are still prevalent, however, some impressive gains have been made. The great majority of black Americans are still faced with chronic unemployment, inadequate health care, insufficient incomes, and low educational levels. Most of these inequities have been underscored in the main body of this document. There is little cause to repeat the fact that the tidal wave of unequal opportunity has not been completely arrested.

There is evidence to suggest that some progress has been made in achieving the goal of equal opportunity for minority group citizens in Houston. This progress has favored the middle class rather than those who were more severely affected and alienated from the main currents of the society. It is a fact which must seriously be pondered. In the next several pages, we will review some of the progress made in Houston to enhance the achievements of minority members of the population. Where do we stand as a city today? How far have we come during the years since the initial Brown decision in 1954? How do we think things are being handled in relation to dealing with inequities and minority grievances in Houston? What, objectively, is the state of race relations in this city? What is the more logical course to pursue in the coming years? These are some important questions -- they are queries to which we sought some of the answers in our conversations with community influentials and directors of organizations in the City. As much as possible, statistical data were collected to show some trends in particular areas of interest.

Economically, blacks and browns have made gains in employment and occupational categories. Though not in record numbers, they are employed in positions with banks, large corporations, at predominantly white colleges and universities (in faculty and non-faculty positions); they are employed in grocery stores as managers and cashiers; and they are employed in positions with the City of Houston. Entry into non-traditional occupational positions in Houston has been characterized primarily by persons comprising what is now referred to as "the rising middle class." For the most part, college graduates -- many of whom were participants in the Sit-In demonstrations of the 1960's -- are the beneficiaries of the struggle for equal opportunity in the South and other parts of the country. The predominantly black college, despite its disadvantaged position in the total educational structure, relentlessly prepared these students to take advantage of the opportunities as they became available. Graduates of these institutions comprise the bulk of those persons in Houston classified as middle class. This is the same group to which Wattenberg and Scammon referred in the April issue of Commentary.

Speaking of black gains, Wattenberg and Scammon noted that revolutionary progress has been made by black Americans and indicated that many have moved into the middle class. The most unfortunate part of the study and its findings was a failure on the part of the authors to make a distinction in terms of class. Vernon Jordan, Jr., director of the National Urban League, commented on some obvious errors in the study. A major criticism was the implication of a "cynical conspiracy among black leaders to deliberately ignore reality as a part of a dishonest strategy to make problems of black Americans seem worse than they really are," says Jordan.[1] The literature on socio-economic progress for minority groups shows that it is an indisputable fact that blacks have made gains and so have whites, and the net result has been that while black income -- in an overall sense -- has gone up, white income has also gone up. The actual dollar gap between the races has widened as a result of this large white increase. This is true in the nation; it is true in Houston.

The Wattenberg-Scammon article also gives the impression that enough blacks have moved into the middle class and that there is a majority at this level. One of the variables questioned in the report is the apparently very loose operational definition used to specify "middle class." If money is used as a determinant of middle class, then the definition is, at best, a truly plastic one. It has long been a fact that plumbers often make more money than school teachers and other white collar workers when measured on an annual scale. By income level alone, these individuals would not be considered middle class.

In Houston, we have found a large proportion of blacks receiving incomes proportionate with middle class status, and many of these same individuals have changed in status during the last decade -- if one uses such variables as income, education, and occupation as determinants of socio-economic status. This is progress in employment and occupation.

What is not progress, however, is the disastrous impact of unemployment on the lives of many individuals trapped in the ghettos of the central city. In some neighborhoods, the rate of unemployment is estimated to be as high as 15 percent. What is even less progress is the fact that black and brown families, of whatever income level, pay more on the average for a given standard of housing than do whites. On the average, they are paid less for their services and they usually have more mouths to feed on their incomes.

EMPLOYMENT WITH THE CITY OF HOUSTON

The employment patterns of blacks in city positions indicate a disproportionate number in lower echelon jobs. In April, 1973, a count of all employees with the City shows the largest number of blacks to be employed in the Solid Waste Department, Model City Health and Parks Divisions; in Public Works, including such areas as garbage, sewage, and street repairs. All employees of Refuse E.E.A. are black; and whites comprise all workers in Public Works-Water C.I.W.A., according to the April report on employment with the City.

Blacks are underrepresented in Fire Protection and Fire Suppression but overrepresented in garbage, sewage, and solid waste positions. Black males hold more positions with the City of Houston than black females. There is also some unevenness in the composition of employees with Model Cities components. There is a substantial number of blacks working with this program. When these employees are added to the total of black employees in Solid Waste, Public Works (garbage and refuse), and various other maintenance categories, a distorted picture of equal employment emerges. The total percentage representation for minority groups in city employment leads one to assume that an equitable distribution means equal opportunity with the City. This is not really the case. The Model Cities program has an almost even distribution of employees by race, with 52 percent black and about 48 percent white. The Mexican-American employees were not delineated in the report which we received. This leads one to assume that a portion of the white percentage is representative of the brown segment of the population.

The number of black employees with the City of Houston totaled 2,805 in April, 1973. Of this total, 2,505 worked in such divisions as garbage, sewage, street repairs, solid waste, and Model Cities components. In fact, 29 percent of the total number of black employees may be found in the Model City and Solid Waste divisions; an additional 30 percent are employed with Public Works, including such areas as garbage, sewage,and street repairs. If you add these percentages to those involving other lower echelon jobs such as Refuse and Prison Farm employees, there is little change to be observed in black employment patterns for the City. The percentage of blacks in administrative and/or clerical positions (mostly white collar occupations) is indeed low. Approximately 90 percent of all blacks employed with the city can be found in lower paying jobs, or they are working in Model Cities component projects. This latter city department is a federally-funded project, and is subject to guidelines which stipulate compliance with the Equal Opportunity Act. An equal employment effort by the City is not clearly visible when the positions held are examined in terms of where blacks fall on the occupational scale with the City. At best, minority group involvement in employment with the City is token.

The internal analysis of city employment, i.e., position held versus qualifications and pay, reveals a different trend than that for the total percentage distribution as a whole. For instance, the April, 1973, employment figures show 12,269 employees with the City. Of this number, 7,706 or 62.8 per cent are white males; 1,736 or 14.1 percent are white females, compared to 2,408 (19.6%) black males; and 397, or less than four percent black females. Total white representation in city employment exceeds 75 percent; and total black representation approximates 23 precent, with over half of the positions held by blacks in maintenance -- mostly unskilled positions save Model Cities components. Another observation relevant to the data is that blacks are more frequently found employed in programs receiving some federal assistance and the probability of their presence increases with the program focus, namely, that they work with programs whose budgetary allocations are for specific improvements in disadvantaged areas. Even where this practice is obvious, few consultant positions are contracted to competent black educators from predominantly black institutions. It is alleged that any black involvement is inherent in limited knowledge by whites about the communities, and some blacks and browns are used so that researchers can move in the areas with greater ease for data collection. One distinguished black sociologist, in discussing the issue, stated that

> . . . the prevailing action embraces the contention that only whites are qualified to deal with areas of research in defining the needs of the black community. I happen to disagree with this action, if this is the case. Black and brown talent is available in this city and in other parts of Texas and the nation. These individuals are just as competent or more competent to understand the needs of the minority groups. Yet, contracts for research and consultation are more often awarded white professors at predominantly white institutions and agencies.

Similar reactions were given by several community influentials interviewed on the subjects of employment and contractual arrangements for consultant work with the City.

Tables 124 and 125 show a frequency and percentage distribution of employees for the City of Houston by race, as of April, 1973.

Table 124

A Numerical and Percentage Distribution of Employees for the City of Houston By Race and Sex (April, 1973)

	Total	White Male		White Female		Black Male		Black Female		Total Black
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Mayor	25	9	36.0	12	48.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	4
Mayor's Manpower	8	4	50.0	3	37.5	0	0	1	12.5	1
Council	17	7	41.2	8	47.1	1	5.9	1	5.9	2
Planned Variation Division	11	6	54.5	4	36.4	0	0	1	9.1	1
Mayor's Model City	6	0	0	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	2
Comptrollers	36	14	38.9	20	55.6	1	2.8	1	2.8	2
Model City	69	18	26.1	15	81.7	8	11.6	28	40.6	36
City Planning	38	22	57.9	13	34.2	2	5.3	1	2.6	3
City Secretary	18	0	0	18	100.0	0	0	0	0	0
Civil Defense	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0	0	0	0
Civil Service	27	11	40.7	14	51.9	0	0	2	7.4	2
Municipal Courts	22	18	81.8	3	13.6	0	0	1	4.5	1
Municipal Courts Administration	118	59	50.0	50	42.4	2	1.7	7	5.9	9
Fire Adm. - Maintenance	166	127	76.5	32	19.3	7	4.2	0	0	7
Fire Prevention	86	80	93.0	0	0	6	7.0	0	0	6
Fire Suppression	1,905	1,820	95.5	0	0	85	4.5	0	0	85
Data Processing	119	46	38.7	63	52.9	1	0.8	9	11.3	10
Health Department	460	219	47.6	136	29.6	53	11.5	52	15.8	105
Health Model City	19	8	42.1	4	21.1	4	21.1	3	0	7
Health Model City	29	3	10.3	1	3.4	25	86.2	0	65.0	25
Health Model City	20	1	5	4	20.0	2	10.0	13	7.7	15
Health - Vaccination Assistant	26	8	30.8	16	61.5	0	0	2	43.4	2
Health - Family Planning	53	4	7.5	22	41.5	4	7.5	23	18.3	27
Health - Maternaity, Infant Care	93	16	17.2	56	60.2	4	4.3	17	2.2	21
Health - Air Pollution	45	34	75.6	10	22.2	0	0	1	11.1	1
Health - Dental Program	9	2	22.2	1	11.1	5	55.6	1	11.8	6
Health - Rodent	34	10	29.4	3	818	17	50.0	4	1.6	21
Legal Department	61	38	62.3	22	36.1	0	0	1	0	1
Park Administration	61	42	68.9	16	26.2	3	4.9	0	1.2	3
Park Department - Park Division	321	216	67.3	5	1.6	96	29.9	4	12.8	100
Park Recreation	234	111	41.4	58	24.8	35	15.0	30	0	65
Park Golf Division	58	46	79.3	2	3.4	10	17.2	0	22.2	10
Park Model City	9	1	11.1	0	0	6	66.7	2	1.6	8
Park Zoo Division	64	45	10.3	15	23.4	3	4.7	1	8.6	4
Police Adm.	558	196	35.1	265	47.5	49	8.8	48	0.4	97
Police Law Enforcement	2,117	2,000	94.5	49	2.3	60	2.8	8	0	68

TABLE 124 (Con't)

	Total	White Male		White Female		Black Male		Black Female		Total Black
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Prison Farm	19	19	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Office Building Division	106	51	48.1	15	14.2	26	24.5	14	13.2	40
Public Service	54	18	33.3	35	64.8	1	1.9	0	0	1
Public Works Adm.	25	11	44.0	14	56.0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Works - Bridge Division	29	25	86.2	0	0	4	13.8	0	0	4
Public Works - Electrical	102	87	85.3	4	3.9	11	10.8	0	0	11
Public Works Engineer Division	234	219	93.6	11	4.7	2	0.9	0	0	2
Public Works Municipal Garbage	140	84	60.0	9	6.4	47	33.6	0	0	47
Public Works Sewer Division	453	271	59.8	6	1.3	176	38.9	0	0	176
Public Works Street Repair	602	284	47.2	3	0.5	315	52.3	0	0	315
Public Works Building Inspection	202	160	79.2	34	16.8	5	2.5	3	1.5	8
Public Works Model City	22	4	18.2	2	9.1	13	59.1	3	13.6	16
Purchasing	38	9	23.7	28	73.7	0	0	1	2.6	1
Real Estate	20	15	75.0	2	10.0	3	15.0	0	0	3
Land Acquisition	32	19	59.4	12	37.5	0	0	1	3.1	1
Real Estate Model City	9	5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1	0	0	1
Traffic and Transportation	85	76	89.4	7	8.2	2	2.4	0	0	2
Traffic Signal Division	91	83	91.2	0	0	8	8.8	0	0	8
Treasury Adm.	24	8	33.3	9	37.5	7	29.2	0	0	7
Tax Department	178	80	44.9	92	51.7	2	1.1	4	2.2	6
Utilities Gas Division	20	11	55.0	5	25.0	3	15.0	1	5.0	4
Solid Waste Department	756	43	5.7	3	0.4	709	93.8	1	0.1	710
Public Works Water Adm.	4	2	50.0	1	25.0	0	0	1	25.0	1
Public Works Water C.I.W.A.	4	4	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Works Water Product	144	95	66.0	5	3.5	44	30.6	0	0	44
Public Works Customer Service	260	91	35.0	113	43.5	27	10.4	9	3.5	36
Public Works Water Maintenance	442	170	38.5	13	2.9	256	57.9	3	0.7	259
Public Works Water Engineer	47	30	63.8	17	36.2	0	0	0	0	0
Public Works San Jacinto Water	61	41	67.2	5	8.2	15	24.6	0	0	15
Aviation Adm.	22	7	31.8	15	68.2	0	0	0	0	0
Aviation Hobby Airport	49	28	57.1	5	10.2	14	28.6	2	4.1	16
Aviation Houston International	305	207	67.9	70	23.0	25	8.2	3	1.0	28
Civic Center	218	144	65.6	12	5.5	53	24.3	10	4.6	63
Library	377	57	15.1	235	62.3	40	10.6	45	11.9	85
Model Cities Library Services	14	0	0	4	28.6	2	14.3	8	57.1	10
Refuse E.E.A.	38	0	0	0	0	38	100.0	0	0	38
Civil Service Pub. Emp.	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	3
Parks E.E.A.	75	3	4.0	0	0	63	84.0	9	12.0	72
Library E.E.A.	14	0	0	0	0	3	21.4	11	78.6	14
Comprehensive Planning Division	2	1	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	1
TOTAL	12,269	7,706	62.8	1,736	14.1	2,408	19.6	397	3.2	2,805

TABLE 125

A NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYEES FOR THE CITY OF HOUSTON BY RACE (APRIL, 1973)

DEPARTMENT	Total for:	BLACKS EMPLOYED	
		Less than 25% (percent)	50% or More (percent)
Mayor		16.0	
Mayor's Manpower		12.5	
Council		11.8	
Planned Variation Division		9.1	
Mayor's Model City			
Controller's		5.6	
Model City			52.2
City Planning		7.9	
City Secretary			
Civil Defense			
Civil Service		7.4	
Municipal Courts		4.5	
Municipal Courts Administration		7.6	
Fire - Adm - Maintenance		4.2	
Fire Prevention		7.0	
Fire Suppression		4.5	
Data Processing		8.4	
Health Department		22.8	
Health Model City			
Health Model City			86.2
Health Model City			75.0
Health Vaccination Ass.		7.7	
Health, Family Planning			50.9
Health Maternity Infant Care		22.6	
Health Air Pollution		2.2	
Health Dental Program			66.7
Health Rodent			61.8
Legal Department		1.6	
Park Admin.		4.9	
Park Dept., Park Division			
Park Recreation			
Park Golf Division		17.2	
Park Model City			88.9
Park Zoo Division		6.3	
Police Admin.		17.4	
Police Law Enforcement		3.2	
Prison Farm			
Office Building Division			
Public Service		1.9	
Public Works Admin.			
Public Works Bridge Division		13.8	
Public Works Electrical		10.8	
Public Works Engineer Division		0.9	

TABLE 125 (Con't)

DEPARTMENT	Total for:	BLACKS EMPLOYED	
		Less than 25%	50% or More
		(percent	(percent)
Public Works Municipal Garbage			
Public Works Sewer Division			
Public Works Street Repair			52.3
Public Works Building Inspection		4.0	
Public Works Model City			72.7
Purchasing		2.6	
Real Estate		15.0	
Land Acquisition		3.1	
Real Estate Model City		11.1	
Traffic & Transportation		2.8	
Traffic Signal Division		8.8	
Treasury Administration			
Tax Department		3.3	
Utilities Gas Div.		20.0	
Solid Waste Department			93.9
Public Works Water Admin.		25.0	
Public Works Water C.I.W.A.			
Public Works Water Product			
Public Works Customer Service		13.9	
Public Works Water Maintenance			58.6
Public Works Water Engineer			
Public Works San Jacinto Water		24.6	
Aviation Admin.			
Aviation Hobby Airport			
Aviation Houston Intercontinental Airport		9.2	
Civic Center			
Library		22.5	
Model City Library Service			71.4
Refuse E.E.A.			100.0
Civil Service Pub. Emp.			60.0
Parks E.E.A.			96.0
Library E.E.A.			100.0
Comprehensive Planning Div.			50.0

EMPLOYMENT: COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

A survey of newspapers, radio stations, and television stations in Houston suggests that these concerns are beginning to absorb minority group talent into their organizational structures. Communication with the community in general, and minority group organizations and institutions in particular, is encouraged through a Community Relations division. Charles Porter of KTRK-TV and Clifton Smith of KPRC-TV serve as directors of Community Relations for the respective stations. The local affiliates of national networks -- ABC, NBC, and CBS -- all have a limited number of minority group persons employed in positions such as sales, accounting, production, cameramen, engineering, secretarial and clerical, film, audio, and other technical positions.

Blacks and Mexican-American individuals serve as newscasters and reporters for local television and radio stations, and coverage is not limited to their communities or groups. One of the more prominent news personalities is Bob Nicholas of Channel 11 (KHOU-TV). Mr. Nicholas has been with the local CBS affiliate for one year and a half as a newscaster. He was formerly with the News Bureau of the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) of Cleveland, Ohio. Napoleon Johnson, Charles Porter, Michael Brown, Clifton Smith, Alvin Hebert, and others represent a shift in imagery -- a shift from subserviency (as was depicted during earlier years) to meaningful participation in the delivery and dissemination of news to the general public. Through appropriate communications channels, the media have contributed to better community understanding of issues relating to the plight of citizens in the city.

There has been progress in radio and newspaper reporting. In the early 1950's, widespread coverage of black-related events was limited mostly to criminal activities. Local dailies, for instance, gave full coverage to the blacks involved in the now famous Selby case. Infrequent appearances of blacks on television and radio were recorded for stations not beamed primarily to the black community. White-owned radio stations such as KCOH and KYOK played mostly music and carried advertisements of the "dollar down and dollar per week" variety. These stations gave only spot coverage of news events. Other coverage by the larger and established radio networks was limited to visits by outstanding national personalities and events surrounding Black History Week (formerly referred to Negro History Week). Race or human relations programs were carried by the media as annual events.

Today, special series and documentaries on black problems and achievements, cultural events which take place at Texas Southern University and area colleges, school activities, and other types of wholesome entertainment are programmed indiscriminately by the communications media of the city and in other parts of the country. These developments, along with the participation of blacks and browns in the production of programs; in the coverage of news events; and in technical aspects of the media represent marks of progress in Houston and the nation.

Black-owned newspapers have made considerable contributions to the total social revolution in Houston. The late Carter Wesley, a noted black journalist and crusader for equal rights, left his imprint on the philosophy which guides the Houston Informer. What was most important about Mr. Wesley's drive for equal rights was the time in which it occurred. He engaged in a form of verbal protest shaped by the conditions of life in Houston, and his viewpoints were disseminated to the black communities throughout Texas and the nation. All class levels were exposed to his ideas and his general position regarding segregation. His black weekly newspaper was a form of collective expression. He used his editorial page to pierce the public mind and tap the public conscience about inequities in Houston, in Texas, and in the United States. His weekly newspaper was circulated to smaller communities throughout Texas. Now deceased, Mr. Wesley's journalistic thrust has been absorbed by a young, dynamic, and competent black, George McElroy. As general manager of the Houston Informer, Mr. McElroy continues to discuss issues of vital importance to the black community. He serves as an assistant professor of Communications at the University of Houston, and writes a column for The Houston Post.

The Forward Times, another weekly newspaper, presents objective coverage of events in the community, with particular emphasis on problems and concerns of the black population. Its managing editor, Varee Shields, Jr., strives for coverage of relevant issues and events. Through its editorial page, The Forward Times points out inconsistencies in positions taken by candidates seeking public office and elected officials, examines the local occupational structure and employment picture, documents criminal activities, and chastises (in its own way) the black and white communities for obvious flaws in their actions and reactions to issues affecting the general public. Through editorial comments, the paper points to contradictions in ideological issues and actual practices concerning equal opportunities in Houston.

Black newspapers and radio stations have generally changed in program content and program focus. Through a mutual black network, national and international news is transmitted to low income residents as well as middle and upper middle class black residents. There is at least one -- perhaps more -- station beamed primarily to the Mexican-Americans in the area. A large proportion of residents in minority communities tune to these stations more often than other such stations in Houston.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PROGRESS

Some gains have been made in economic development through the Minority Business Program. These gains have not been enough to change the general status of powerlessness among minority groups in this regard. Accomplishments have also been noted for employment, income, and occupational pursuits. Despite entry into non-traditional areas of employment and occupation, unemployment and underemployment problems are prevalent in the Houston area. The black unemployment rate for the

Houston SMSA was 6.3 percent in 1967 as compared with 2.4 percent for whites; it was 5.7 percent as compared with 2.6 percent for whites in 1968; and the unemployment rate was 6.7 percent for blacks in 1969 as compared with 2.3 percent for whites. These unemployment rates and levels represent annual averages for the periods mentioned. In the central city, the average rate was 6.3 percent for blacks compared to 2.7 percent for whites in 1967; it was 5.8 percent for blacks as compared to 2.5 percent for whites in 1968; and 6.6 percent for blacks as compared to 2.1 percent for whites in 1969. An urban employment survey during the same period -- July, 1968 through June, 1969 -- shows that the unemployment rate for blacks in the original CEP (the Labor Department's Concentrated Employment Area) was found to be 9.5 percent.[2] If we examine individual census tracts on unemployment in Houston, it is shown that some inner city areas register rates of unemployment ranging from 8.8 percent to as high as 15 percent.

Equal employment opportunities exist in Houston in some federally-funded jobs and in private industry. Discrimination in employment as a whole has not disappeared. An analysis of the practices of labor unions in certain sectors indicates that there have been some instances of discrimination. For blacks, union construction jobs have been granted on a token basis except for the laborer and cement masons ranks. A 1971 Labor Department publication gave this account of opposition from unionized manufacturing industries:

> We are getting more opposition from organized labor than from employers. The employer is out to sell products and get profits for the stockholders. He doesn't really care who produces the products. But to get maximum production, he must get all of the workers to work together and get along with one another . . .[3]

The report further states that "labor unions are unwilling to sign contracts that give equal treatment to blacks. Too often blacks are seen as individuals posing threats to holders of certain jobs and they'd rather see one of their own in the position that a minority might hold..." Continuing, it is alleged that "in order for blacks to get a chance in the line of progression, he is often asked to waive all of his previous seniority and start at the bottom of the new line ...or they say blacks must take a test to enter that line..."[4] Ray Marshall, director of the Negro Employment Project of the South, feels that to the degree that these impressions are valid, unionism has not served as a major force in the improvement of the employment status of black workers in Houston and elsewhere.

Occupationally, blacks and browns are found at the lower end of the scale. Breaking down major occupational groupings into detailed classifications makes it clear that the largest gains for minorities in Houston were in factory operatives. The next largest were increases in clerical jobs -- from 2.1 percent in 1966 to 6.5 percent in 1969 for black workers; and from 2.3 percent in 1966 to 4.7 percent for Mexican-American workers in 1969. Future projections appear to indicate increases in professional and technical occupations, salaried management positions, craft occupations, and other protective service categories.

Whatever changes occurred in the unemployment status of minorities, especially black men, can be explained in part by shifts in their occupational distribution as well as general economic changes between 1960 and 1970. To be sure, some of the changes in occupational status are attributable to employment in federal programs initiated by the Johnson Administration's "Great Society" programs and HUD-sponsored Model Cities programs. Through such programs, minority group members with appropriate training and qualifications were able to gain the necessary experience for entry into managerial and technical positions. Such opportunities were, heretofore, denied by virtue of practices of discrimination.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF PROGRESS

Since the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the number of black registered voters has increased. Minority groups in Houston and throughout Texas have begun to participate more fully in the political process. This upsurge in black voter activity relates to two possible factors: the abolition of the Poll Tax in Texas and the advent of single-member legislative districts.

Prior to 1970 there were no minority group members in elective municipal positions in Houston, although there had been black and brown candidates. At present there is one black City Councilman, Judson W. Robinson, Jr. and a brown City Controller, Leonel J. Castillo, in municipal government in Houston. In addition, blacks serve as judges and they are also found in other appointive positions. City Councilman Judson W. Robinson, Jr. was recently appointed to the Board of Directors of Texas Southern University. He joins several other blacks on the TSU governing board, including Municipal Judge Andrew L. Jefferson. Mack H. Hannah, Jr., another black, serves on the Board of Regents of the University of Houston. Dr. Robert J. Bacon, a black physician, was recently appointed to the Texas Board of Corrections. In addition to his private practice, Bacon teaches urology at Baylor College of Medicine, serves on the active academic staff of St. Joseph Hospital, and practices medicine at other city hospitals. The Texas Board of Corrections administers the Texas prison system, with over 15,000 inmates. Of the total prison population, blacks comprise 43 percent of the group; whites, 38 percent; Mexican-Americans, 16 percent; with the remaining three percent listed as others or unclassified. Despite the disproportionate representation of blacks among the inmate population, there has never been a time in Texas when more than one black served in a governing capacity with the Texas Department of Corrections. It is not known whether any member of the Mexican-American population has ever been appointed to the Board of Corrections of the Texas Prison System.

Education

Inequities in education still exist in Houston. Inadequate school facilities, mainly because of overcrowdedness in inner city schools, and the general conditions under which children are taught in the central city indicate differences in the quality of education offered black and brown children as opposed to white children. Usually in these schools, classes are larger and the physical plant is older.

Colleges and universities in the area have student populations composed primarily of one race. Both Texas Southern University and the University of Houston have rather large Mexican-American enrollments.

Hospitals

Minority group members are admitted to hospitals and clinics in Houston on a non-discriminatory basis. Public hospital facilities have been opened for many years to all Houstonians. If discrimination exists in health services, it is related more to economics than to segregation.

Public Accommodations

There has been widespread voluntary compliance with the law regarding places of public accommodations. When the 1964 Civil Rights Act was passed, some fears were expressed concerning the change in established customs which implied that proprietors of such places would experience serious economic loss if services were extended to blacks and other minorities. Today, this fear has subsided and public accommodations are available to all.

Housing

The condition of housing for blacks has improved since the late 1950's and the early 1960's. Yet, a large proportion of blacks in Houston still live in dilapidated dwellings. Discriminatory practices exist in the sale of housing, but these acts are more individual than institutional or collective. Blacks are moving into "suburbia." Most black leaders believe that "money will get blacks in any area if they are willing to pay exorbitant prices to live in certain areas." However, it is not always that easy.

What appears to be the greatest concern among all classes of black Houstonians is the lack of a Fair Housing Ordinance, strong and effective Housing Code enforcement, and the absence of zoning regulations. These factors appear to contribute to segregation and neighborhood deterioration.

In a special report on "Understanding Fair Housing" (Houston Chronicle, May 1, 1973), the Civil Rights Commission said that "segregation in housing did not develop spontaneously . . . " Additionally, "widespread segregated neighborhoods resulted from official action of federal, state, and local governments in conjunction with the private housing industry." There is some evidence to indicate that private parties such as builders, lenders, and brokers make decisions as to where housing will be located, the class and color of its occupancy, how it will be financed, and to whom it will be sold and rented. The Civil Rights Commission further charged that "government is a key participant in these decisions. It controls most of the theoretically 'private' decisions concerning housing..." The housing industry, aided and abetted by government, must bear the primary responsibility for the legacy of segregated housing, the report further advised. It is ironic that this trend supposedly exists in the nation when voices are loudest on the busing issue. It is difficult to see any end to the dual system of education unless measures are taken to integrate housing or the alternative of busing is used to initiate desegregated classrooms. The anti-busing advocates may find it more feasible to direct their protests to the appropriate agencies and officials, and to examine carefully the practices of the housing industry -- public and private.

Housing problems do have a relationship to other social issues such as education and integration. There is widespread polarization between the races in Houston despite progress in areas such as public accommodations and employment. Chase Untermeyer, a Houston Chronicle reporter, (April 8, 1973), reviewed integration efforts by clubs and organizations in Houston. Only a few of the organizations contacted were still practicing segregation. Clubs and organizations with open memberships "have either token or no black and Mexican-American members," the report said. The Kiwanis Club, Grand Lodge of the Protective Order of Elks, components of veterans groups, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Sons of the American Revolution, and the American Legion, are organizations without mixed memberships. The Rotary Club, the Houston Bar Association, and the Houston Medical Forum list some minority group members. The International Association of Lions Clubs recently granted a charter to the Riverside Lions Club of Houston, the first predominantly black organization of its kind ever chartered in Houston. This newly-chartered Lions subsidiary has twenty-five (25) members.

Segregation is still practiced in a majority of the churches in Houston. Catholic churches have always maintained an open-door policy. Membership in Catholic and Protestant churches, however, generally parallels the racial make-up of neighborhoods. Religious integration is prevalent in areas where neighborhood transition is in progress. Also, some ecumenical and religious cooperation is taking place among the pastorate of Houston churches.

Application for citizenship in the United Klans of America (KKK) is restricted to white males. In answer to an inquiry concerning membership in the Houston branch of the KKK, "Action Line" (The Houston Post, May 13, 1973) publicized portions of an application for membership in the organization. The form read, in part, this way: "being a white male Gentile person of temperate habits, sound in mind and a believer in the tenets of the Christian religion, the maintenance of White Supremacy and the principles of a pure Americanism, do respectively apply for membership in the United Klans of America..." Obviously, this organization limits its membership by race and sex. Its existence serves as a reminder for those who would insist that the ancient blinders of racism have disappeared in Houston. The Ku Klux Klan advertises its fundamental beliefs in racial separation and commitment to racial segregation. Such beliefs and attitudes are part of a seamless web intertwined in the climate of the City. It reminds us that some persons still desire the type of isolation as was experienced in days past.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

An urban challenge of major proportions unfolds as one reviews the problems, the progress, and the prospects for minority groups in Houston. Despite court orders, the laws and ordinances passed; despite the achievements made by mostly middle class blacks and browns; despite the legislative victories and speeches made by those engaged in the struggle for social change and equal rights, there exists a widening gulf between rich and poor -- between black and white; brown and white. Economic hardships are encountered by the poor and the aged. Latent racism continues unabated. One manifestation of this is in the area of housing; in a lack of genuine concern for the delivery of services to the poor. Other examples may be found in the continued existence of slum areas; in inequities in income; in law enforcement; and in the availability of health services to blacks, other minorities, and the poor. Beyond racism, there is the challenge to work toward building an open society in Houston, as was suggested by the late Whitney M. Young, Jr. in his book, Beyond Racism.[5] Young, like President Lyndon B. Johnson and President John F. Kennedy along with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., had hopes for America. Johnson illustrates this best:

> . . . Freedom is not enough. You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying: Now you are free to go where you want, do as you desire, and choose the leaders you please...Thus it is not enough to open the gates of opportunity. All of our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates . . .[6]

He further demonstrated his commitment to human rights and equal justice when he told the graduates of Howard University that "we seek not just freedom but opportunity -- not just legal equity but human ability -- not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and a result..." These words were echoed many years ago now, but the commitment to human rights in America and in Houston has yet to be fulfilled.

The building of a more open society in Houston is a matter of individual commitment; of institutional commitment, of local will and sanction. The selection of programs and strategies for change must become consistent with human needs and creative acts of public policy. The challenge ahead will require firm commitments and dedicated leadership -- a leadership which can and will transform "the commands of our laws into the customs of our society." The challenge ahead will require setting and achieving goals for improving the lives of all citizens, especially the less fortunate.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *The Forward Times*, May 5, 1973.

[2] *Negro Employment in the South: The Houston Labor Market,* Manpower Research Monograph No. 23, U. S. Department of Labor, 1971, pp. 25-26.

[3] *Ibid*.

[4] *Ibid*.

[5] Whitney M. Young, Jr., *Beyond Racism* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969).

[6] "To Fulfill These Rights," Remarks by President Lyndon B. Johnson at Howard University, Washington, D. C., June 4, 1965.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 126
CENSUS TRACT FOR HOUSTON

TRACT	ALL PERSONS	WHITE	% WHITE	BLACK	% BLACK
0121	3,719	3,137	85.8	527	14.2
0122	4,627	3,695	81.6	853	18.4
0123	2,042	1,794	91.1	182	8.9
0124	4,822	790	17.8	3,965	82.2
0125	1,391	1,284	95.2	167	4.8
0126	7,448	1,042	15.7	6,280	84.3
0201	10,834	82	.9	10,741	99.1
0202	6,532	5,749	90.6	613	9.4
0202.99	35	27	80.0	7	20.0
0203	13,497	11,499	87.4	1,700	12.6
0204	4,167	57	1.5	4,105	98.5
0205	16,235	954	6.3	15,206	93.7
0206	9,231	1,065	12.1	8,115	87.9
0207	10,159	894	9.4	9,202	90.6
0208	14,711	1,844	13.0	12,803	87.0
0209	875	854	97.7	20	2.3
0210	11,981	1,336	11.4	10,619	88.6
0211	37	-	-	37	100.0
0213	5,311	5,091	96.2	203	3.8
0214	3,586	2,921	82.9	614	17.1
0215	16,983	7,773	47.0	9,080	53.0
0216	6,796	1,574	23.6	5,191	76.4
0217	11,807	1,535	13.7	10,194	86.3
0218	11,190	5,759	53.1	5,251	46.9
0219	5,964	3,841	65.7	2,046	34.3
0220	6,904	6,621	96.8	219	3.2
0221	2,478	2,462	-	-	-
0223	191	191	-	-	-
0224	3,792	247	7.0	3,525	93.0
0225	14,860	4,672	32.4	10,051	67.6
0226	2,992	2,854	95.7	128	4.3
0227	5,818	5,793	99.9	4	.1
0228	21	21	-	-	-
0230	437	434	-	-	-
0231	6,965	6,939	-	1	-
0232	5,750	5,718	-	-	-
0232.99	94	90	96.8	3	3.2
0233	9	9	-	-	-
0234	12	12	-	-	-
0236	78	78	-	-	-
0237	44	44	-	-	-

TABLE 126
CENSUS TRACT FOR HOUSTON (CONT.)

TRACT	ALL PERSONS	WHITE	% WHITE	BLACK	% BLACK
0240	297	297	-	-	-
0241	1,406	1,396	99.7	4	.3
0243	1,698	1,367	80.6	329	19.4
0244	26	4	15.4	22	84.6
0245	1,218	1,213	99.6	5	.4
0247	58	58	-	-	-
0248	358	357	99.7	1	.3
0249	540	513	-	25	4.6
0250	103	103	-	-	-
0251	223	220	-	-	-
0253	32	32	-	-	-
0254	15	15	-	-	-
0301	10,545	10,350	95.4	10	.1
0302	5,813	5,451	95.7	251	4.3
0303	3,581	158	4.8	3,410	95.2
0304	14,304	218	1.9	14,033	98.1
0305	11,318	79	1.0	11,210	99.0
0306	7,634	832	11.3	6,771	88.7
0307	12,519	564	4.6	11,938	95.4
0308	7,024	5,314	80.1	1,470	20.9
0309	9,723	9,545	99.2	79	.8
0310	6,322	6,251	99.8	12	.2
0311	9,356	9,185	99.2	75	.8
0311.99	39	28	82.1	7	17.9
0312	7,973	7,673	99.6	31	.4
0312.99	6	6	-	-	-
0313	9,801	9,707	99.7	33	.3
0314	7,621	4,816	64.1	2,737	35.9
0315	7,663	2,175	29.6	5,391	70.4
0316	5,544	2,570	49.0	2,825	51.0
0317	15,484	4,229	28.5	11,078	71.5
0318	19,071	9,112	48.7	9,787	51.3
0319	5,786	5,740	99.7	15	.3
0320	15,447	15,349	99.9	16	.1
0321	11,704	9,882	85.8	1,664	14.2
0322	11,760	11,706	-	-	-
0323	8,408	8,329	99.8	16	.2
0324	11,900	11,747	99.8	25	.2
0325	9,213	9,142	-	3	-
0326	7,729	7,693	-	1	-
0327	10,399	5,254	51.3	5,065	48.7
0328	16,144	3,733	23.3	12,351	76.5
0329	10,526	96	1.1	10,410	98.9
0330	5,413	154	2.9	5,257	97.1

TABLE 126
CENSUS TRACT FOR HOUSTON (CONT.)

TRACT	ALL PERSONS	WHITE	% WHITE	BLACK	% BLACK
0331	1,029	1,006	98.1	20	1.9
0332	6,479	4,762	74.0	1,683	26.0
0333	2,742	2,184	80.6	552	19.4
0334	5,376	5,044	94.3	309	5.7
0335	12,921	12,573	98.0	259	2.0
0338	2,641	2,588	99.2	21	.8
0339	10,017	40	.5	9,962	99.5
0340	7,451	606	8.3	6,834	91.7
0342	1,080	1,079	100.0	-	-
0343	7,187	1,962	28.4	5,149	71.6
0344	1,706	1,698	.9	1	.1
0345	6,601	6,575	100.0	-	-
0346	1,970	1,963	100.0	-	-
0347	18,217	18,121	99.9	10	.1
0359	789	768	99.9	1	.1
0361	4	-	-	-	-
0361.99	118	85	86.4	16	13.6
0362	12	12	100.0	-	-
0367	373	370	100.0	-	-
0370	746	717	97.2	21	2.8
0371	1,596	1,589	99.7	4	.3
0401	5,963	5,424	92.7	433	7.3
0402	11,551	11,012	96.8	368	3.2
0403	7,058	6,901	99.1	67	.9
0404	6,805	6,663	99.4	39	.6
0405	9,340	9,167	99.8	19	.2
0406	5,978	5,845	98.6	86	1.4
0407	10,349	10,114	98.7	142	1.3
0412	9,956	9,801	99.4	62	.6
0413	8,654	8,511	99.8	13	.2
0414	8,948	8,705	99.7	73	.3
0415	14,834	14,624	99.6	56	.4
0416	18,611	18,375	99.9	17	.1
0419	14,169	13,932	99.4	91	.6
0420	14,091	13,937	99.6	63	.4
0421	3,698	3,660	99.6	16	.4
0422	16,269	16,152	99.8	28	.2
0423	17,616	15,737	90.0	1,760	10.0
0424	12,590	12,501	99.9	15	.1
0425	14,997	14,836	99.7	38	.3
0426	7,640	7,583	99.9	6	.1
0427	6,118	6,072	100.0	3	-
0428	8,476	8,410	99.8	18	.2
0429	4,616	4,553	99.7	15	.3
0430	3,439	3,407	99.7	12	.3

TABLE 126
CENSUS TRACT FOR HOUSTON (CONT.)

TRACT	ALL PERSONS	WHITE	% WHITE	BLACK	% BLACK
0431	6,951	6,898	99.9	8	.1
0432	2,345	2,335	99.7	6	.3
0433	3,169	2,868	91.2	280	8.8
0434	16	13	81.2	3	18.8
0435	5,835	5,793	100.0	1	-
0438	2,837	2,833	100.0	-	-
0439	3,845	3,829	99.9	5	.1
0440	3,690	3,663	98.8	7	.2
0441	50	50	100.0	-	-
0442	12,955	12,919	97.7	35	.3
0443	23,189	23,119	100.0	8	-
0444	18,175	18,077	100.0	7	-
0445	12,343	12,306	99.9	7	.1
0446	17,403	17,354	99.9	9	.1
0447	10,181	10,146	100.0	2	-
0501	126	69	55.6	56	44.4
0502	3,211	477	20.2	2,562	79.8
0503	13,777	12,002	92.8	986	7.2
0504	4,097	2,364	59.0	1,678	41.0
0505	6,220	4,200	70.0	1,863	30.0
0506	9,901	9,762	99.5	50	.5
0507	8,603	8,529	99.5	39	.5
0508	5,925	4,181	73.7	1,561	26.3
0509	12,867	10,391	82.9	2,204	17.1
0510	6,865	585	8.8	6,263	91.2
0511	6,951	6,879	99.7	18	.3
0512	7,617	7,512	99.8	12	.2
0513	3,501	3,116	89.4	371	10.6
0514	7,709	3,149	42.3	4,451	57.7
0515	8,023	6,989	88.5	925	11.5
0516	7,778	7,467	71.0	227	2.9
0517	13,449	13,091	81.0	260	1.9
0518	13,561	11,044	82.0	2,439	18.0
0519	13,602	11,671	76.4	1,851	13.6
0520	12,975	7,019	56.7	5,621	43.3
0521	10,253	10,114	99.0	14	.1
0522	11,967	11,902	95.0	5	-
0523	11,908	11,789	98.0	26	.2
0524	2,121	153	7.4	1,964	92.6
0525	3,898	941	35.4	2,948	75.6
0526	16,491	16,312	82.0	113	.7
0527	9,680	9,636	-	4	-
0528	2,033	741	36.4	1,288	63.4
0529	4,349	4,336	-	2	-
0531	253	6	2.4	247	97.6
0532	2,905	2,890	100.0	-	-
0533	114	114	100.0	-	-

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County)		
	White	Black	% Black
0121	3,137	527	14.2
0122	3,695	853	18.4
0123	1,794	182	8.9
0124	790	3,965	82.2
0125	1,284	67	4.8
0126	1,042	6,280	84.3
0201	82	10,741	99.1
0202	5,749	613	9.4
0202.99	27	7	20.0
0203	11,499	1,700	12.6
0204	57	4,105	98.5
0205	954	15,206	93.7
0206	1,065	8,115	87.5
0207	894	9,202	90.6
0208	1,844	12,803	87.0
0209	854	20	2.3
0210	1,336	10,619	88.6
0211	-	37	100.0
0213	5,091	203	3.8
0214	2,921	614	17.1
0215	7,773	9,080	53.5
0216	1,574	5,191	76.4
0217	1,535	10,194	86.3
0218	5,759	5,251	46.9
0219	3,841	2,046	34.3
0220	6,621	219	3.2
0221	2,462	-	-
0223	191	-	-
0224	247	3,525	93.0
0225	4,672	10,051	67.6
0226	2,854	128	4.3
0227	5,793	4	0.1
0228	21	-	-
0230	434	-	-
0231	6,939	1	-
0232	5,718	-	-
0232.99	90	3	3.2
0233	9	-	-
0234	12	-	-
0236	78	-	-
0237	44	-	-

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) Cont.		
	White	Black	% Black
0240	297	-	-
0241	1,396	4	0.3
0243	1,367	329	19.4
0244	4	22	84.6
0245	1,213	5	0.4
0247	58	-	-
0248	357	1	0.3
0249	513	25	4.6
0250	103	-	-
0251	220	-	-
0253	32	-	-
0254	15	-	-
0301	10,350	10	0.1
0302	5,451	251	4.3
0303	158	3,410	95.2
0304	218	14,033	98.1
0305	79	11,210	99.0
0306	832	6,771	88.7
0307	564	1,938	95.4
0308	5,314	1,470	20.9
0309	9,545	79	0.8
0310	6,251	12	0.2
0311	9,185	75	0.8
0311.99	28	7	17.9
0312	7,673	31	0.4
0312.99	6	-	-
0313	9,707	33	0.3
0314	4,816	2,737	35.9
0315	2,175	5,391	70.4
0316	2,570	2,825	51.0
0317	4,229	11,078	71.5
0318	9,112	9,787	51.3
0319	5,740	15	0.3
0320	15,349	16	0.1
0321	9,882	1,664	14.2
0322	11,706	4	-
0323	8,329	16	0.2
0324	11,747	25	0.2
0325	9,142	3	-
0326	7,693	1	-
0327	5,254	5,065	48.7
0328	3,733	12,351	76.5
0329	96	10,410	98.9

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) Cont.		
	White	Black	% Black
0330	154	5,257	97.1
0331	1,006	20	1.9
0332	4,762	1,683	26.0
0333	2,184	532	19.4
0334	5,044	309	5.7
0335	12,573	259	2.0
0338	2,588	21	0.8
0339	40	9,962	99.5
0340	606	6,834	91.7
0342	1,079	-	-
0343	1,962	5,149	71.6
0344	1,698	1	0.1
0345	6,575	-	-
0346	1,963	-	-
0347	18,121	10	0.1
0359	768	1	0.1
0361	-	-	-
0361.99	85	16	13.6
0362	12	-	-
0367	370	-	-
0370	717	21	2.8
0371	1,589	4	0.3
0401	5,424	433	7.3
0402	11,012	368	3.2
0403	6,901	67	0.9
0404	6,663	39	0.6
0405	9,167	19	0.2
0406	5,845	86	1.4
0407	10,114	142	1.4
0412	9,801	62	0.6
0413	8,511	13	0.2
0414	8,785	23	0.3
0415	14,624	56	0.4
0416	18,375	17	0.1
0419	13,932	91	0.6
0420	13,937	63	0.4
0421	3,660	16	0.4
0422	16,152	28	0.2
0423	15,737	1,760	10.0
0424	12,501	15	0.1

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) Cont.		
	White	Black	% Black
0425	14,836	38	0.3
0426	7,583	6	0.1
0427	6,072	3	-
0428	8,410	18	0.2
0429	4,553	15	0.3
0430	3,407	12	0.3
0431	6,898	8	0.1
0432	2,335	6	0.3
0433	2,868	280	8.8
0434	13	3	18.8
0435	5,793	1	-
0438	2,833	-	-
0439	3,829	5	0.1
0440	3,663	7	0.2
0441	50	-	-
0442	12,919	35	0.3
0443	23,119	8	-
0444	18,077	7	-
0445	12,306	7	0.1
0446	17,354	9	0.1
0447	10,146	2	-
0501	69	56	44.4
0502	477	562	79.8
0503	12,002	986	7.2
0504	2,364	1,678	41.0
0505	4,200	1,863	30.0
0506	9,762	50	0.5
0507	8,529	39	0.5
0508	4,181	1,561	26.3
0509	10,391	2,204	17.1
0510	585	6,263	91.2
0511	6,879	18	0.3
0512	7,512	12	0.2
0513	3,116	371	10.6
0514	3,149	4,451	57.7
0515	6,989	925	11.5
0516	7,467	227	2.9
0517	13,091	260	1.9
0518	11,044	2,439	18.0
0519	11,671	1,851	13.6

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) Cont.		
	White	Black	% Black
0520	7,019	5,621	43.3
0521	10,114	14	0.1
0522	11,902	5	-
0523	11,789	26	0.2
0524	153	1,964	92.6
0525	941	2,948	75.6
0526	16,312	113	0.7
0527	9,636	4	-
0528	741	1,288	63.4
0529	4,336	2	-
0531	6	247	97.6
0532	2,890	-	-
0533	114	-	-

Census Tract	Baytown		
	White	Black	% Black
0261	179	-	-
0263	4,063	3	0.1
0264	2,427	888	26.4
0265	1,728	121	6.5
0266	4,976	7	0.1
0267	4,038	19	0.5
0268	1,441	11	0.8
0269	6,336	53	0.8
0270	4,553	31	0.7
0271	3,154	3	0.1
0272	3,570	805	18.3
0273	3,797	215	5.3
0274	1,365	2	0.1
0275	-	-	-

Census Tract	Pasadena		
	White	Black	% Black
0349	9,502	6	0.1
0350	8,831	9	0.1
0351	3,981	-	-
0352	273	-	-
0353	11,368	5	-
0355	14,335	5	-
0356	13,067	9	0.1
0357	18,871	6	-
0358	4,273	1	-
0359	4,056	-	-
0360	47	-	-
0366	236	4	1.7

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Balance of Harris County		
	White	Black	% Black
0211	9,057	1,358	13.0
0212	9,522	-	-
0222	6,120	271	4.2
0223	11,347	600	5.0
0224	9,648	679	6.5
0225	287	691	70.2
0226	22	-	-
0228	3,241	-	-
0229	1,781	-	-
0230	17,984	9	-
0233	1,571	4	0.3
0233.99	36	2	5.3
0234	2,557	8	0.3
0235	3,921	2	0.1
0236	1,663	-	-
0237	568	1	0.2
0238	2,547	-	-
0239	5,289	77	1.4
0240	8,104	4	-
0241	2,378	1	-
0242	859	-	-
0243	29	6	17.1
0244	1,653	216	11.5
0245	3,234	33	1.0
0246	618	873	58.2
0247	274	-	-
0248	57	-	-
0249	1,813	-	-
0250	355	-	-
0251	1,679	3	0.2
0252	549	4	0.7
0253	894	136	13.2
0254	779	-	-
0255	1,657	20	1.2
0256	435	10	2.2
0257	577	1	0.2
0258	1,877	2,745	59.3
0259	4,413	2,016	31.3

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Balance of Harris County (Cont.)		
	White	Black	% Black
0260	147	19	11.4
0261	1,607	25	1.5
0262	836	17	2.0
0263	590	1	0.2
0264	...	...	...
0267	769	-	-
0268	329	1	0.3
0269	...	...	...
0275	77	-	-
0334	175	-	-
0336	1,217	26	2.1
0337	359	67	15.7
0341	252	73	21.0
0348	11,416	28	0.2
0350	9	-	-
0359	6	-	-
0360	12,721	1	-
0361	...	...	...
0362	119	-	-
0363	989	-	-
0364	740	17	2.2
0365	4,807	906	15.8
0366	6,531	-	-
0367	167	-	-
0368	6,222	7	0.1
0369	2,234	27	1.2
0371	7,774	16	0.2
0372	596	-	-
0373	10,360	30	0.3
0374	5,439	6	0.1
0375	66	-	-
0408	3,345	1	-
0409	3,947	2	0.1
0410	5,942	5	0.1
0411	1,459	1	0.1
0417	12,571	8	0.1
0418	6,321	2	-
0422	214	3	1.4
0433	3,156	9	0.3
0434	828	33	3.8

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Balance of Harris County (Cont.)		
	White	Black	% Black
0435	98	-	-
0436	10,347	15	0.1
0437	128	18	12.3
0438	4,898	53	1.1
0439	19	2	9.5
0440	12,899	17	0.1
0441	3,788	-	-
0445	530	-	-
0446	3,633	-	-
0447	3,647	8	0.2
0448	207	5	2.3
0449	166	12	6.7
0450	181	3	1.6
0451	254	18	6.6
0452	2,373	43	1.8
0525	1,352	5,404	79.9
0529	160	4	2.4
0530	4,032	4,871	54.6
0531	5,907	7,524	55.8
0532	9,775	6	0.1
0533	10,469	14	0.1
0534	1,725	6	0.3
0535	281	1	0.4
0536	2,294	-	-
0537	1,259	22	1.7
0538	1,810	173	8.7
0539	1,642	140	7.8
0540	2,082	-	-
0541	1,916	-	-
0542	1,232	997	44.7
0543	492	-	-
0544	25	9	24.3
0545	4,488	-	-
0546	346	53	13.3
0547	325	132	28.9
0548	351	1	0.3
0549	355	41	10.4
0550	417	8	1.9

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Balance of Harris County (Cont.)		
	White	Black	% Black
0551	1,194	42	3.4
0552	1,170	18	1.5
0553	2.421	309	11.3
0554	432	3	0.7
0555	697	242	25.7
0556	1,727	1	0.1
0557	257	203	44.1
0558	2,503	2	0.1
0559	1,775	393	18.1

Census Tract	Totals for Split Tracts in Harris County		
	White	Black	% Black
0211	9,057	1,395	13.3
0223	11,538	600	4.9
0224	9.895	4,204	29.5
0225	4,959	10,742	67.8
0226	2,876	128	4.2
0228	3,262	-	-
0230	18,418	9	-
0233	1,580	4	0.3
0234	2,569	8	0.3
0236	1,741	-	-
0237	612	1	0.2
0240	8,401	4	-
0241	3,774	5	0.1
0243	1,396	335	19.3
0244	1,657	238	12.5
0245	4,447	38	0.8
0247	332	-	-
0248	414	1	0.2
0249	2,326	25	1.1
0250	458	-	-
0251	1,899	3	0.2
0253	926	136	12.8
0254	794	-	-

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Totals for Split Tracts in Harris County (Cont.)		
	White	Black	% Black
0261	1,786	25	1.4
0263	4,653	4	0.1
0264	2,430	888	26.4
0267	4,807	19	0.4
0268	1,770	12	0.7
0269	6,338	53	0.8
0275	81	-	-
0334	5,219	309	5.6
0350	8,840	9	0.1
0359	4,830	1	-
0360	12,768	1	-
0361	8	-	-
0362	131	-	-
0366	6,767	4	0.1
0367	537	-	-
0371	9,363	20	0.2
0422	16,366	31	0.2
0433	6,024	289	4.5
0434	841	36	4.1
0435	5,891	1	-
0438	7,731	53	0.7
0439	3,843	7	0.2
0440	16,562	24	0.1
0441	3,836	-	-
0445	12,836	7	0.1
0446	20,987	9	-
0447	13,793	10	0.1
0525	2,293	8,352	78.4
0529	4,496	6	0.1
0531	5,913	7,771	56.5
0532	12,655	6	-
0533	10,583	14	0.1

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION
BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	County -- Brazoria		
	White	Black	% Black
0601	6,082	13	0.2
0602	6,408	118	1.8
0603	2,484	27	1.0
0604	8,515	176	2.0
0605	4,637	182	3.8
0606	875	70	7.4
0607	754	80	9.6
0608	2,487	1,637	39.5
0609	4,950	25	0.5
0610	2,572	67	2.5
0611	2,631	-	-
0612	1,489	404	21.3
0613	1,381	308	18.2
0614	1,394	1,107	44.1
0615	326	58	15.1
0616	715	24	3.2
0617	1,284	822	38.8
0618	1,359	360	20.9
0619	3,699	689	15.6
0620	6,506	1,455	18.3
0621	377	618	62.1
0622	1,369	16	1.2
0623	1,034	158	13.2
0624	236	5	2.1
0625	13,672	50	0.4
0626	6,244	336	5.1
0627	1,841	28	1.5
0628	3,920	562	12.5
0629	6,625	722	9.8
0629.99	74	16	16.7
0630	669	1	0.1
0631	1,015	3	0.3
0632	61	-	-

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	County -- Fort Bend		
	White	Black	% Black
*0701	53	-	-
0701	8,801	1,131	11.3
0702	2,400	49	2.0
0703	3,539	1,510	29.8
0704	658	132	16.6
0705	510	390	42.6
0706	1,224	634	33.8
0707	5,683	2,074	26.7
0708	124	120	49.0
0709	8,873	615	6.5
0710	6,074	572	8.6
0711	1,176	137	10.4
0712	354	854	68.3
0713	2,272	585	20.4
0714	1,427	73	4.9

Census Tract	Total for split Tract in Fort Bend County		
	White	Black	% Black
0701	8,854	1,131	11.2

---

*Houston (part in Fort Bend County)

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Adjacent Tracts in Waller County		
	White	Black	% Black
0801	407	26	6.0
0802	1,541	1,637	51.2
0803	2,354	4,141	63.6
0804	2,373	1,702	41.1

Census Tract	Houston (part in Montgomery County)		
	White	Black	% Black
0901	9	-	-

Census Tract	Balance of Montgomery County		
	White	Black	% Black
0901	5,822	45	0.8
0902	4,778	395	7.6
0903	3,415	335	8.9
0904	618	578	48.2
0905	1,362	136	9.1
0906	8,064	844	9.4
0907	5,831	1,801	23.5
0908	5,133	87	1.7
0909	1,259	23	1.8
0910	3,474	346	9.0
0911	3,183	884	21.6
0912	513	366	41.5

TABLE 127
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Total for Split Tract in Montgomery County		
	White	Black	% Black
0901	5,831	45	0.8

Census Tract	Liberty County		
	White	Black	% Black
1001	2,674	-	-
1002	3,704	2,052	35.6
1003	1,663	-	-
1004	836	79	8.6
1005	952	134	12.2
1006	1,257	204	14.0
1007	2,631	171	6.1
1008	620	137	18.0
1009	3,241	1,947	37.4
1010	3,262	903	21.6
1011	3,370	730	23.5
1012	2,843	504	15.0

Census Tract	Adjacent Tracts in Chambers County		
	White	Black	% Black
1101	3,107	498	13.8
1102	1,217	1,194	49.5
1103	3,525	488	12.1
1104	1,822	307	14.4

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) Persons per Household
0121	1.30
0122	4.04
0123	3.54
0124	2.54
0125	1.89
0126	2.89
0201	3.15
0202	3.79
0202.99	-
0203	3.54
0204	2.90
0205	3.19
0206	3.47
0207	3.73
0208	3.67
0209	3.85
0210	3.72
0211	5.29
0213	3.44
0214	3.48
0215	3.86
0216	3.87
0217	3.86
0218	3.49
0219	3.32
0220	3.41
0221	3.67
0223	4.06
0224	4.30
0225	4.07
0226	3.88
0227	3.66
0228	3.50
0230	3.47
0231	3.60
0232	3.04
0232.99	-
0233	1.50
0234	2.40

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY, 1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) (Cont.) Persons per Household
0236	3.00
0237	3.14
0240	4.23
0241	3.68
0243	3.82
0244	2.89
0245	3.50
0247	3.05
0248	3.62
0249	2.76
0250	2.34
0251	3.14
0253	3.56
0254	2.50
0301	3.22
0302	2.53
0303	3.11
0304	2.90
0305	2.85
0306	2.85
0307	2.87
0308	2.73
0309	2.39
0310	3.08
0311	3.46
0311.99	-
0312	3.58
0312.99	-
0313	2.56
0314	2.95
0315	2.99
0316	2.24
0317	3.17
0318	3.45
0319	2.56
0320	2.55
0321	3.06
0322	3.56
0323	2.81
0324	2.71

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD
BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) (Cont.) Persons per household
0325	3.24
0326	3.35
0327	3.96
0328	4.01
0329	3.57
0330	3.32
0331	1.88
0332	4.11
0333	3.83
0334	3.89
0335	3.94
0338	3.47
0339	4.22
0340	4.15
0342	3.34
0343	3.98
0344	2.97
0345	3.59
0346	5.25
0347	3.71
0359	3.62
0361	...
0361.99	-
0362	...
0367	2.96
0370	3.22
0371	3.89
0401	2.27
0402	2.05
0403	1.73
0404	1.89
0405	1.79
0406	2.71
0407	2.07
0412	2.26
0413	2.54
0414	2.58
0415	3.15
0416	2.79
0419	2.23

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) (Cont.) Persons per household
0420	2.09
0421	2.43
0422	2.29
0423	2.82
0424	2.98
0425	3.39
0426	3.29
0427	4.14
0428	3.85
0429	3.80
0430	3.12
0431	3.74
0432	3.74
0433	4.12
0434	2.67
0435	3.56
0438	3.91
0439	3.38
0440	2.94
0441	2.38
0442	3.14
0443	3.40
0444	3.54
0445	3.62
0446	4.08
0447	3.83
0501	3.71
0502	2.97
0503	3.56
0504	3.32
0505	3.22
0506	2.47
0507	2.69
0508	3.57
0509	3.04
0510	3.34
0511	2.73
0512	2.48
0513	2.79
0514	3.01

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD
BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Houston (part in Harris County) (Cont.) Persons per household
0515	2.64
0516	3.05
0517	3.14
0518	2.96
0519	3.14
0520	3.30
0521	2.90
0522	3.35
0523	3.43
0524	3.22
0525	3.49
0526	3.28
0527	3.78
0528	4.19
0529	3.67
0531	3.51
0532	3.71
0533	3.56

Census Tract	Baytown Persons per household
0261	3.14
0263	3.49
0264	3.51
0265	3.27
0266	2.83
0267	3.64
0268	3.22
0269	3.11
0270	3.05
0271	3.06
0272	2.76
0273	2.94
0274	2.83
0275	-

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Pasadena Persons per household
0349	3.23
0350	3.10
0351	2.71
0352	3.22
0353	3.55
0355	3.70
0356	3.29
0357	3.45
0358	3.34
0359	3.16
0360	4.70
0366	2.55

Census Tract	Balance of Harris County Persons per household
0211	3.33
0212	3.29
0222	3.71
0223	3.94
0224	3.64
0225	4.39
0226	3.60
0228	3.66
0229	4.16
0230	3.51
0233	3.26
0233.99	-
0234	3.29
0235	3.33
0236	3.27
0237	3.48
0238	4.03
0239	3.72

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Balance of Harris County (Cont.) Persons per household
0240	3.86
0241	3.74
0242	3.76
0243	3.89
0244	3.90
0245	3.02
0246	3.37
0247	4.15
0248	2.85
0249	3.76
0250	3.48
0251	3.72
0252	3.53
0253	3.46
0254	3.42
0255	3.10
0256	3.59
0257	3.50
0258	3.74
0259	3.53
0260	3.46
0261	3.54
0262	3.71
0263	3.20
0264	-
0267	3.52
0268	3.71
0269	-
0275	2.66
0334	2.90
0336	3.39
0337	3.78
0341	3.73
0348	3.30
0350	...
0359	...
0360	3.85
0361	...
0362	2.74
0363	3.50
0364	3.10

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Balance of Harris County (Cont.)
	Persons per household
0365	3.20
0366	3.47
0367	3.34
0368	3.46
0369	3.37
0371	3.94
0372	3.66
0373	3.50
0374	2.86
0375	3.52
0408	2.55
0409	2.55
0410	2.46
0411	2.41
0417	3.20
0418	3.10
0422	3.50
0433	3.80
0434	3.63
0435	3.40
0436	3.61
0437	3.48
0438	3.75
0439	2.33
0440	3.66
0441	3.44
0445	3.42
0446	4.30
0447	3.78
0448	3.47
0449	3.03
0450	3.78
0451	3.37
0452	3.44
0525	3.98
0529	4.00
0530	3.77
0531	3.72
0532	3.80
0533	3.54
0534	3.10

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Balance of Harris County (Cont.) Persons per household
0535	3.57
0536	3.30
0537	3.52
0538	3.24
0539	3.47
0540	3.58
0541	3.60
0542	4.11
0543	3.37
0544	3.36
0545	3.85
0546	3.84
0547	3.31
0548	2.98
0549	3.02
0550	3.34
0551	3.60
0552	3.38
0553	3.03
0554	3.37
0555	3.55
0556	3.58
0557	3.59
0558	3.55
0559	3.38

Census Tract	Totals for Split Tracts in Harris County Persons per household
0211	3.33
0223	3.94
0224	3.79
0225	4.09
0226	3.88
0228	3.66

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Totals for Split Tracts in Harris County (Cont.) Persons per household
0230	3.56
0233	3.24
0234	3.28
0236	3.26
0237	3.45
0240	3.88
0241	3.72
0243	3.83
0244	3.88
0245	3.14
0247	3.91
0248	3.49
0249	3.47
0250	3.14
0251	3.64
0253	3.46
0254	3.40
0261	3.50
0263	3.45
0264	3.51
0267	3.62
0268	3.30
0269	3.11
0275	2.61
0334	3.85
0350	3.10
0359	3.22
0360	3.85
0361	...
0362	2.83
0366	3.42
0367	3.07
0371	3.93
0422	2.30
0433	3.95
0434	3.61
0435	3.56
0438	3.81
0439	3.37

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Totals for Split Tracts in Harris County (Cont.) Persons per household
0440	3.47
0441	3.42
0445	3.61
0446	4.11
0447	3.82
0525	3.79
0529	3.68
0531	3.72
0532	3.78
0533	3.54

Census Tract	Brazoria County Persons per household
0601	3.75
0602	3.71
0603	3.58
0604	3.26
0605	3.62
0606	3.05
0607	3.86
0608	3.29
0609	3.19
0610	3.44
0611	3.51
0612	3.49
0613	3.88
0614	3.34
0615	3.25
0616	3.23
0617	3.16
0618	3.46
0619	3.37
0620	3.35
0621	3.32
0622	3.37
0623	3.40
0624	2.62

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Brazoria County (Cont.) Persons per household
0625	3.55
0626	3.44
0627	3.47
0628	3.04
0629	3.20
0629.99	-
0630	2.74
0631	3.13
0632	2.90

Census Tract	Houston (part in Fort Bend County) Persons per household
0701	3.31

Census Tract	Fort Bend County Persons per household
0701	3.87
0702	3.54
0703	3.83
0704	3.99
0705	3.34
0706	3.79
0707	3.73
0708	3.06
0709	3.39
0710	3.61
0711	3.40
0712	3.63
0713	3.42
0714	3.36

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Total for Split Tract in Ft. Bend County
	Persons per household
0701	3.87

Census Tract	Adjacent Tracts in Waller County
	Persons per household
0801	3.45
0802	3.42
0803	3.03
0804	3.05

Census Tract	Total for Split Tract in Montgomery County
	Persons per household
0901	3.55

Census Tract	Houston (part in Montgomery County)
	Persons per household
0901	...

TABLE 128
NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT & COUNTY
1970

Census Tract	Balance of Montgomery County Persons per household
0901	3.55
0902	3.63
0903	3.43
0904	3.30
0905	3.07
0906	3.01
0907	3.30
0908	3.57
0909	3.36
0910	3.23
0911	3.03
0912	3.21

Census Tract	Liberty County Persons per household
1001	2.99
1002	3.11
1003	3.13
1004	3.21
1005	2.86
1006	3.23
1007	3.01
1008	3.08
1009	3.23
1010	3.07
1011	3.30
1012	3.26

Census Tract	Adjacent Tracts in Chambers County Persons per household
1101	3.10
1102	3.12
1103	3.47
1104	2.87

TABLE 129

Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population in Dallas and Houston by ethnic group, sex, and age--1970 annual averages

(Numbers in thousands)

Area, ethnic group, sec, and age	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force		Employment	Unemployment			
		Number	Participation rate		Level	Range (±)[1]	Rate	Range[2]
DALLAS								
SMSA: Total	1,026	723	70.5	696	27	5	3.8	3.1- 4.5
White	919	637	69.3	616	21	4	3.3	2.6- 4.0
Men 20 years and over	398	362	91.0	355	7	2	1.9	1.3- 2.5
Women 20 years and over	435	224	51.5	218	6	2	2.7	1.9- 3.5
Both sexes, 16-19 years	86	50	58.1	42	8	3	15.5	11.3-19.7
Negro and other races	107	87	81.3	80	7	3	7.7	4.9-10.5
Women 20 years and over	50	(3)	-	-	-	-	-	- -
Central city: Total	555	401	72.3	386	15	4	3.9	3.1- 4.7
White	465	328	70.4	318	9	3	2.8	1.9- 3.7
Negro and other races	90	73	81.8	67	6	3	8.6	5.6-11.6
HOUSTON								
SMSA: Total	1,165	790	67.8	758	31	5	4.0	3.4- 4.6
White	953	642	67.4	622	20	4	3.2	2.6- 3.8
Men 20 years and over	412	373	90.5	369	5	2	1.3	.8- 1.8
Women 20 years and over	441	210	47.6	203	7	2	3.3	2.4- 4.2
Both sexes, 16-19 years	100	59	59.0	51	8	3	14.2	10.4-18.0
Negro and other races	212	147	69.3	136	11	4	7.5	5.6- 9.4
Men 20 years and over	87	73	83.9	71	(4)	-	-	- -
Women 20 years and over	101	61	60.4	58	5	3	8.2	4.1-12.3
Central city: Total	834	571	68.4	549	21	5	3.8	3.0- 4.6
White	622	424	68.2	414	10	3	2.5	1.7- 3.3
Negrc and other races	212	146	69.0	135	11	4	7.5	5.6- 9.4

---

[1] In 90 cases out of 100, the unemployment level from a complete census would fall within a range which had the limits of plus or minus the level shown.

[2] In 90 out of 100, on the average, the unemployment rate from a complete census would fall within the indicated ranges.

[3] Not shown where level of civilian labor force is less than 50,000.

[4] Not shown where unemployment estimate is less than 5,000.

NOTE: Individual items may not add to totals due to rounding.

SOURCE: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1970 Employment Characteristics. "Dallas & Houston, Texas." (Tables 129-34).

Table 130

Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population in Texas by ethnic group, sex, and age--1970 annual averages

(Numbers in thousands)

Ethnic group, sex, and age	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force		Employment	Unemployment			
		Number	Participation rate		Level	Range (±)[1]	Rate	Range[2]
Total	7,403	4,612	62.3	4,407	205	18	4.4	4.1- 4.7
White	6,528	4,034	61.8	3,873	161	16	4.0	3.7- 4.3
Men 20 years and over	2,735	2,327	85.1	2,271	56	10	2.4	2.1- 2.7
Women 20 years and over	3,081	1,358	44.1	1,306	53	10	3.9	3.1- 4.7
Both sexes, 16-19 years	712	349	49.0	296	52	10	14.9	12.5- 17.3
Negro and other races	875	578	66.1	534	44	10	7.6	6.2- 9.0
Men 20 years and over	356	292	82.0	281	11	5	3.8	2.4- 5.2
Women 20 years and over	412	240	58.3	220	19	6	7.9	6.8- 10.0
Both sexes, 16-19 years	107	(3)	-	-	-	-	-	- -

---

[1] In 90 cases out of 100, the unemployment level from a complete census would fall within a range which had the limits of plus or minus the level shown.

[2] In 90 out of 100, on the average, the unemployment rate from a complete census would fall within the indicated ranges.

[3] Not shown where level of civilian labor force is less than 50,000.

NOTE: Individual items may not add to totals due to rounding.

Table 131

Full- and part-time status of the civilian labor force in Texas, Dallas, and Houston by ethnic group--1970 annual averages

(Numbers in thousands)

Area	Full-time labor force					Part-time labor force			
	Total	Employed		Unemployed (Looking for full-time work)		Total	Employed on voluntary part-time	Unemployed (looking for part-time work)	
		Full-time schedules	Part-time for economic reasons	Number	Percent of full-time labor force			Number	Percent of part-time labor force
TEXAS									
Total	4,039	3,720	157	162	4.0	573	530	43	7.5
White	3,548	3,309	114	125	3.5	486	450	37	7.5
Negro and other races	491	411	43	37	7.6	87	80	7	7.6
DALLAS									
SMSA: Total	642	607	14	22	3.4	81	76	5	6.7
White	568	543	10	15	2.7	69	64	5	7.7
Negro and other races	75	64	(1)	7	8.8	(2)	-	-	-
HOUSTON									
SMSA: Total	704	660	20	24	3.5	85	78	7	8.3
White	574	547	12	15	2.7	68	63	5	7.4
Negro and other races	130	113	8	9	6.9	(2)	-	-	-

---

[1] Not shown where part-time for economic reasons is less than 5,000.

[2] Not shown where level of labor force is less than 50,000.

NOTE: Individual items may not add to totals due to rounding.

Table 132
Employed persons 16 years old and over in Texas
by occupation, sex, and ethnic group--1970 annual averages

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	All persons			White			Negro and other races		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Number employed................	4,407	2,744	1,664	3,873	2,443	1,430	534	300	234
Percent........................	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White collar.................	48.3	40.2	61.6	52.3	43.4	67.6	18.9	14.0	25.2
Professional and technical.	13.2	12.9	13.5	14.1	14.0	14.4	6.1	4.6	8.0
Managers, officials, and proprietors..............	11.0	14.7	5.0	12.1	15.9	5.5	3.4	4.8	(1)
Clerical...................	17.4	6.4	35.5	18.7	6.7	39.1	8.3	4.1	13.8
Sales......................	6.7	6.1	7.6	7.5	6.8	8.6	1.1	(1)	(1)
Blue collar..................	33.8	47.2	11.9	32.8	45.3	11.6	41.2	62.7	13.7
Craftsmen and foremen......	13.1	20.3	1.2	13.8	21.1	1.3	8.1	13.8	(1)
Operatives.................	15.5	18.7	10.1	14.8	17.6	9.9	20.5	27.3	11.8
Nonfarm laborers...........	5.3	8.1	(1)	4.2	6.5	(1)	12.6	21.6	(1)
Service......................	13.9	6.9	25.5	11.0	5.8	19.7	35.4	15.9	60.5
Private household..........	2.8	(1)	7.3	1.5	(1)	4.1	12.0	(1)	26.7
All other..................	11.2	6.9	18.2	9.5	5.8	15.7	23.4	15.4	33.7
Farm.........................	4.0	5.7	1.0	3.9	5.5	1.1	4.5	7.4	(1)

---

[1] Not shown where level of employment is less than 5,000 or percentage is less than one percent.

NOTE: Individual items may not add to totals due to rounding.

Table 133
Employed persons 16 years old and over in Dallas SMSA by occupation, sex, and ethnic group--1970 annual averages

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	All persons			White			Negro and other races		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Number employed[1]	696	426	270	616	380	236	80	(3)	(3)
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	-
White collar	59.3	52.9	69.4	64.5	57.6	75.6	19.2	-	-
Professional and technical	16.0	17.3	14.0	17.3	18.8	14.8	-	-	-
Managers, officials, and proprietors	13.1	18.8	4.2	14.7	20.8	4.8	-	-	-
Clerical	21.7	7.7	43.9	23.1	7.7	47.8	-	-	-
Sales	8.4	9.1	7.3	9.4	10.2	8.3	-	-	-
Blue collar	28.6	38.9	12.3	26.3	36.1	10.5	46.2	-	-
Craftsmen and foremen	11.4	17.7	(2)	11.6	18.0	(2)	-	-	-
Operatives	13.3	14.9	10.8	11.7	13.2	9.1	-	-	-
Non farm laborers	3.9	6.3	(2)	3.1	4.8	(2)	-	-	-
Service	11.5	7.2	18.2	8.6	5.4	13.7	33.7	-	-
Private household	1.9	(2)	4.8	1.2	(2)	3.1	-	-	-
All other	9.5	7.1	13.3	7.4	5.4	10.6	-	-	-

---

[1] Total includes farm workers not shown separately.
[2] Not shown where level of employment is less than 5,000 or percentage is less than one percent.
[3] Not shown where employment is less than 80,000.

NOTE: Individual items may not add to totals due to rounding.

Table 134

Employed persons 16 years old and over in Houston SMSA by occupation, sex, and ethnic group--1970 annual averages

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	All persons			White			Negro and other races		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Number employed[1]	758	469	289	622	394	228	136	(3)	(3)
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	-
White collar	50.2	39.6	67.5	55.8	44.0	76.3	24.9	-	-
Professional and technical	12.5	12.0	13.5	14.1	13.5	15.2	-	-	-
Managers, officials, and proprietors	11.0	14.3	5.6	12.3	15.6	6.6	-	-	-
Clerical	19.2	6.5	39.9	20.5	6.8	44.2	-	-	-
Sales	7.5	6.9	8.5	8.8	8.0	10.2	-	-	-
Blue collar	36.0	53.1	8.1	34.8	50.7	7.3	41.3	-	-
Craftsmen and foremen	14.7	23.0	(2)	15.4	23.7	(2)	-	-	-
Operatives	16.3	22.5	6.3	15.9	21.9	5.7	-	-	-
Non farm laborers	5.0	7.6	(2)	3.4	5.1	(2)	-	-	-
Service	13.6	7.0	24.4	9.3	5.2	16.4	33.3	-	-
Private household	2.7	(2)	7.0	1.0	(2)	2.8	-	-	-
All other	11.0	6.9	17.4	8.3	5.1	13.6	-	-	-

---

[1] Total includes farm workers not shown separately.
[2] Not shown where level of employment is less than 5,000 or percentage is less than one percent.
[3] Not shown where employment is less than 80,000.

NOTE: Individual items may not add to totals due to rounding.

DIRECTORY OF HOSPITALS*
(HOUSTON AND HARRIS COUNTY)

1973

BAYTOWN GENERAL HOSPITAL - 191 beds, a general hospital. Volunteers are needed to work with patients and the staff. An emergency room program has recently begun. Volunteers are on duty day and night, seven days a week. There is also a junior program. Call Mrs. Douglas, 427-0511.

BELLAIRE GENERAL HOSPITAL - 170 beds, a general hospital. Both adult and junior volunteers are needed in all traditional volunteer work areas. This hospital is particularly proud of its junior program which includes Candy Striping for girls (floor work) and Medi-Stats for boys (emergency room; sorry, no girls work in this area). Call Pauline Claiborne, 666-1721.

BEN TAUB GENERAL HOSPITAL - (Harris County Hospital District) - About 500 beds, a public general hospital with a particularly well equipped and recognized emergency room. Volunteers work throughout the hospital and clinics on floors, as nurses' aides, in the chapel, at information desks, in emergency room. Volunteers are used seven days a week, almost around the clock. A four-hour shift system is generally used, but hours are flexible. Eighteen is the preferred minimum age, but exceptions have been made. Men and retired people are encouraged to apply. No junior program. Call Gerry Newton, 529-3211.

CLEAR LAKE HOSPITAL - 144 beds, a general hospital, (almost brand new). Volunteers are needed in the gift shop, therapy, work with patients and staff. Auxiliary needsvolunteers all the time, but particularly between 3 and 6 p.m. Need "unencumbered" people for weekend work and to supervise new junior program. Call Mrs. Sharp, 332-2511.

*Source: *The Houston Post*, appeared in a series.

DIAGNOSTIC CENTER HOSPITAL - 300 beds, medical/ surgical hospital. No adult program. Taking applications for junior program to begin this summer. Call General Nursing Office, 522-1711.

DOCTORS HOSPITAL - 108 beds, a general hospital. Volunteers needed to work with patients, handle food trays, patient mail, errands for patients, letterwriting. Tour is provided after interview. Call Ginger Russell, 695-6041.

EASTWAY GENERAL - 115 beds, a general community hospital. Volunteers needed for all areas of traditional patient-contact work. Volunteers work seven days a week; hours are flexible. A year-round junior program: 14 years minimum age with parental consent. Personal training on the job. Call Mrs. Rufus Phillips, Sugarland, 494-2781.

HEIGHTS HOSPITAL - 175 beds, general hospital. Volunteers needed to work in gift shop, with coffee carts, handle patients' mail and flowers. Auxiliary. Work in four-hour shifts, week days for adult group. Junior program: Weekend work, 14½ minimum age. Call Blanche McGrew, 861-6161.

HERMANN HOSPITAL - About 700 beds, expanding to more than 1,000 by 1976; a teaching hospital for University of Texas Medical School in Houston. Volunteers work at nursing stations, do "legwork" for staff, work at surgery desk information, Ob-Gyn floor desk (aiding families), in out-patient clinic, gift shop, and with patient charts. Volunteers work in three shifts weekdays; 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Saturdays, noon to 4:30 p.m. Sundays. Eighteen is preferred minimum age for adult program (or high school completed). Auxiliary: Hermann Hospital Volunteers Inc. Junior program: Saturday and Sunday during school year, regular shifts during the summer. Minimum age for juniors: 15. Call Jane Helander, 527-4141, 527-4142, 527-4143.

JEFFERSON DAVIS HOSPITAL, (Harris County Hospital) - Almost 350 beds, a public hospital specializing in maternity and infant care (overseeing 900 babies a month). Volunteers have an unusual amount of patient-contact. Many patients have no family, no friends. Volunteers work in the nursery, OB clinics, pediatrics, offices, information desks in labor and delivery. Hours are flexible but nursery help needed weekends. Special needs include a couple to run Bingo games one evening a week, and someone to oversee a crafts program. TB tests and chest x-ray required and furnished. Junior program: 16 minimum age, summers. Call Dorothy Braden, 224-1199.

MEDICAL ARTS HOSPITAL - 127 beds, general medical/surgical hospital. Adult auxiliary currently organized, would like to hear from those interested in joining Junior program (Peppermints): 14 minimum age, for girls and boys, one-day orientation, beginning first of June. Call Mrs. Mattocks, 228-8181.

MEMORIAL CITY GENERAL HOSPITAL - 200 beds, general full-service hospital. A non-fund-raising, work-oriented, carefully trained volunteer group called The Volunteer Service. Work is in 3½ hour shifts, five days a week. Age: 20-65. Two-hour interview, 3-day orientation-training program, fire-safety training program, all of which must be completed. No junior program. Call Mary Nolan, 461-5400.

MERCY HOSPITAL - 29 beds, a general community hospital. Volunteers work with patients, many of which are Medicaids who need "follow-up" help while in the hospital. Staff volunteers seven day a week when possible. Interviewed by administrator Dr. J. B. Jones. Junior program: Candy Striper program beginning, to work at information desk, read to patients, entertain children. Call Dr. Jones' office, 733-5421.

RIVERSIDE GENERAL HOSPITAL - 107 beds, a general community hospital. Volunteers work in the gift shop; with patients, planning their meals, arranging their hair, distributing magazines; some office work. Volunteers work seven days a week; hours are flexible. Minimum age is 17; male volunteers especially encouraged. For juniors, 14 to 17: Candy Stripers are presently girls only, but boy volunteers are encouraged to apply. Call Orpha E. Boone, 526-2441.

ROSEWOOD GENERAL HOSPITAL - 189 beds, a general community hospital. Auxiliary. Volunteers work at an information desk, in central supply, and in office, beauty salon, psychiatric and physical therapy units. There is an attempt to have volunteers on duty seven days a week; a shift system is used but hours can be made more flexible. Adult program: 18 minimum age. Junior program: 15 years minimum, year-around and particularly active during the summer. Call Mildred Abernathy, 782-9515.

ST. ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL - 120 beds, a general community hospital. Volunteers do some fund-raising work in connection with an auxiliary. The general work puts emphasis on patient contact. Shift system used but hours are flexible. Junior program: 14 years minimum age, year-around. Parental consent required. Call Geraldine Webster, 675-1711.

ST. LUKE'S EPISCOPAL HOSPITAL - 738 beds and expanding, a general hospital. Auxiliary. Volunteers handle patients' mail, coffee and medical-education carts for staff, information desks, international patient service (bi-lingual volunteers greatly needed), gift shop. Volunteers work in shifts, a minimum of three hours a week required. Volunteers on duty seven days a week. Help is particularly needed on Fridays and during weekends. Junior program: 15 minimum age. Call Mrs. L. C. Spiller, 521-3049.

ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL - 769 beds, a general community hospital. Volunteers divided into two programs: "psychiatric volunteers", especially trained, staff the referral service for those seeking mental health information or aid, and the "regulars". "Regulars" are needed throughout the week in emergency, on floors, at information desks. This hospital particularly encourages men, careerists, students, and retired people to apply. Auxiliary. Four hours a week is work minimum. Junior program: 14 minimum age, summer, includes training program. If you are interested in the "regulars", call Jimmie Cobden, 225-3131. For the "psychiatric volunteers", call Jo Swanlund, 225-3131.

SMA HOUSTON MEMORIAL HOSPITAL - 135 beds and expanding, a general community hospital. More than usual amount of patient contact. Volunteers also work in the emergency room, at nursing stations, reception desks. Auxiliary. Shift system used; volunteers are on duty five days a week. Adult program minimum age is 19. Junior program: 14-18, with parental consent, year-around program. Call volunteer Information Desk, 468-4311.

SHARPSTOWN GENERAL HOSPITAL - 141 beds, general community hospital. Volunteers work the floor, handling lunch trays and errands for patients, assist patients to therapy, direct gift shop and information booth. Help is especially needed weekends. Volunteers work seven days a week, in shift system. Auxiliary Junior program: 14 minimum age, parental consent, preference given to those interested in entering medical field. Call Marjorie Clendenin, 774-7611.

SOUTHMORE HOSPITAL AND CLINIC - 160 beds, general community hospital. Volunteers direct information desk and gift shop, assist patients to medical appointment, handle mail, magazine, meals. Auxiliary. Adults handle Monday through Friday duties. Junior program: 15 age minimum, year-around; juniors handle weekend duties. Call Lillie Evans, 473-2811.

TEXAS INSTITUTE FOR REHABILITATION AND RESEARCH - 64 beds with 1,750 out-patients; a special center for care and treatment of the severely disabled (spinal injury, birth defects, strokes, etc.). Auxiliary. Volunteers have much staff and patient contact. Handle shampoos, laundry, bed making, recreational trips, church trips and corner store. Volunteers organized in shifts, work seven days a week. Junior program: 15 minimum age. Year-around, heavy in summer, parental consent. Call Nita Weil, 526-4281.

TIDELANDS HOSPITAL - 100 beds, a general community hospital. Volunteers handle food trays, getting patients to medical appointments, errands for patients and staff, letter writing for patients. Adults handle daytime, Monday through Friday duties. Minimum age: 19. Junior program: Candy Stripers, 15 minimum age, year-around. Call Barbara Montroy. 452-1511.

TWELVE OAKS HOSPITAL - 300 beds and expanding, a general hospital. Volunteers handle patients' mail, other personal services, floor stations. Auxiliary. Staffing five days a week; a shift system but flexible. Adult program has 18-year age minimum. Male volunteers encouraged to apply. Junior program: To begin in near future. Call Debbie Self, 621-3420.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS M. D. ANDERSON HOSPITAL AND TUMOR INSTITUTE - 300 beds and expanding to 650 in next four years, almost 700 clinic patients per day expanding to 2,100 four years; a cancer research institute and hospital. General volunteer duties. A special need: Someone who will catalogue books and organize a library. Hours of work flexible. No formal junior program: one is planned for the future. At this time, preferred minimum age is 17. Prefer the young who are interested in a health profession. Call Cynthia Clark, 526-5411.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL - 1,330 beds; a general medical and surgical hospital with a large psychiatric and rehabilitation service. Volunteer work is divided into two types - that which offers much patient contact (assisting patients to and from medical appointments) or no patient contact (office work). Volunteers needed seven days a week, 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. Hours are flexible. Junior program: 15 minimum age, year-around. Call Twyla Leonard, 747-3000.

TABLE 135

MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

HARRIS COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

PARTY	REPRESENTATIVE	U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT	OPPONENT
Black Liberal Democrat	Dr. Joe Gathe	District 18	Unopposed
Moderate Democrat	E. M. Huggins, Jr.	District 22	Republican Miles Rutherford
Moderate Democrat	William N. Kemp	District 8	Republican Joe Stevens
Incumbent Democrat	William H. Fetter	District 9	Unopposed
Conservative Republican	Joe Kelly Butler	District 7	Conservative Democrat Carl Denson
NEW MEMBERS			
Liberal Democrat	Mrs. Johnnie Marie Grimes	District 5	Unopposed
Liberal Democrat	Duane J. Mc Cullough	District 14	Unopposed
Liberal Democrat	Mrs. Jane Wells	District 10	Republican Mrs. Rosella Burchfield
Moderate Democrat	Glen L. Smith	District 11	Raza Unida John W. Garibay
Democrat	James N. Binion	District 17	Republican James Rominger
Democrat	Carlisle Cravens	District 24	Unopposed
Mexican-Amer. Democrat	Omar Garza, M.D.	District 15	Raza Unida Abel P. Ochoa
Mexican-Amer. Democrat	Mrs. Albert Trevino	District 20	Republican Ralph Cardenas and Raza Unida Gabriel Manzano
Republican	Dr. Stanley B. McCaleb	District 3	Democrat Marvin Kress
Moderate-Conservative	Mrs. Ronald B. Smith	District 6	Unopposed
INCUMBENT MEMBERS RE-ELECTED			
Democrat	Vernon Baird	District 12	Unopposed
Democrat	E. R. Gregg, Jr.	District 1	Unopposed
Democrat	George C. Guthrie	District 23	La Raza Unida Mrs. Marta Cotera
Democrat	Paul Matthews	District 4	Unopposed
Democrat	Carl E. Morgan	District 2	Republican W. G. Reinhart
Democrat	Frank M. Poole	District 21	Unopposed
Democrat	James H. Whiteside	District 19	Unopposed
Democrat	Herbert O. Willborn	District 13	Republican Janet Parnell
Conservative Democrat	Ben R. H. Howell, Chairman	District 16	Liberal Republican Bruce Bixler

SOURCE: Houston Post

Table 136
A Numerical and Percentage Distribution of Voters in Mayoral Campaign by Race (Houston, 1971)*

ITEM	TOTAL VOTERS	PERCENTAGE
Southwest	182,097	39.90
Black	119,292	26.14
Latin	22,707	4.98
Southeast	51,290	11.24
Northside	77,917	17.08
Student	3,019	.66
TOTAL	456,322	100.00

---

*Based on registration as of June 14, 1971.

Table 137
A Distribution of Predominantly Black Precincts by Presidential and Gubernatorial Candidates and Percentage Turnout
(Harris County-November, 1972)

Precinct	Total Registered	Total Voted	McGovern	Nixon	Briscoe	Grover	Percentage Turnout
7	3,479	1,860	1,310	515	1,273	359	54
19	701	287	262	20	253	23	41
20	655	316	218	92	185	81	48
21	1,330	692	666	18	606	23	52
23	754	355	319	14	299	14	47
24	2,165	1,010	920	61	903	59	47
25	2,540	1,354	1,301	21	1,242	36	53
30	1,276	736	709	17	635	43	58
31	2,430	1,548	1,497	31	1,390	48	64
42	6,526	3,472	3,317	100	2,885	142	53
47	2,637	1,443	1,374	40	1,251	49	55
48	1,257	762	719	23	697	22	61
53	1,435	822	368	430	399	331	57
68	2,887	1,739	1,669	40	1,551	53	60
85	1,905	1,127	1,086	33	974	76	59
104	3,264	1,843	1,243	564	1,208	473	57
107	1,802	1,060	637	391	644	304	59
109	2,235	1,169	1,118	38	1,031	48	52
115	2,399	1,442	464	916	662	676	60
122	2,156	1,333	876	429	864	336	62
132	4,403	2,628	2,256	344	1,968	377	60
136	3,484	1,992	1,889	82	1,566	141	57
138	2,094	1,131	1,073	31	1,022	39	54
140	2,827	1,711	1,481	203	1,183	252	61
144	2,099	1,234	1,159	43	1,028	68	59
145	2,894	1,772	1,575	156	1,458	150	61
147	3,704	2,578	488	2,047	632	1,835	70
151	2,619	1,594	1,366	193	1,235	196	61
156	2,353	1,530	1,258	254	1,035	272	65
157	2,455	1,356	1,298	33	1,186	51	55
158	2,740	1,665	1,613	26	1,482	47	61
159	1,334	917	883	24	841	25	69
160	1,281	733	665	37	637	32	57
161	2,442	1,382	1,306	41	1,200	57	57
164	2,146	1,420	1,377	30	1,276	44	66
167	232	168	146	7	134	9	72
168	1,354	738	698	32	644	38	55
169	1,397	788	651	26	667	38	56

Table 137
A Distribution of Predominantly Black Precincts by Presidential and Gubernatorial Candidates and Percentage Turnout (Cont.)
(Harris County-November, 1972)

Precinct	Total Registered	Total Voted	McGovern	Nixon	Briscoe	Grover	Percentage Turnout
171	1,351	800	391	394	429	297	59
180	3,388	2,034	1,845	147	1,673	160	60
186	2,188	1,271	1,161	69	1,081	73	58
192	1,621	1,107	1,050	35	936	62	68
193	1,805	1,093	1,048	27	950	40	61
194	2,778	1,555	1,125	410	896	390	56
195	2,790	1,683	1,603	50	1,430	75	60
196	1,376	847	745	83	604	64	62
197	2,615	1,566	1,490	48	1,357	70	60
198	1,451	874	829	33	757	32	60
201	1,827	1,051	955	12	840	50	58
202	1,808	1,059	998	35	909	50	59
209	721	410	392	13	357	21	57
210	2,343	1,338	1,252	67	1,115	83	57
212	2,258	1,308	1,192	86	1,089	87	58
219	3,030	1,789	1,497	362	1,231	361	59
228	901	624	502	117	420	131	69
230	3,171	1,932	1,844	55	1,686	82	61
235	3,618	2,162	1,811	306	1,537	328	60
236	1,751	1,067	894	157	812	154	61
237	2,015	1,160	1,036	105	922	107	58
238	2,689	1,524	1,244	254	1,102	249	57
239	2,251	1,415	1,196	195	1,062	203	63
240	2,988	1,949	1,875	43	1,707	86	65
247	3,129	1,686	1,604	33	1,472	62	54
248	334	214	200	12	191	14	64
250	924	666	640	19	603	30	72
251	1,595	983	888	85	853	84	62
252	3,801	2,502	2,119	149	1,917	193	66
253	2,848	1,805	1,729	42	1,670	38	63
259	3,196	2,321	2,137	122	1,985	143	73
271	1,687	1,231	1,197	23	1,036	80	73
276	2,145	1,312	1,173	112	1,085	107	61
288	2,375	1,566	1,349	155	1,200	160	66
294	1,696	1,123	1,094	15	979	42	66
295	1,706	1,065	1,027	23	956	34	62
318	2,523	1,722	1,055	634	924	565	68
327	1,906	1,131	1,100	20	1,008	42	59

Table 137
A Distribution of Predominantly Black Precincts by Presidential and Gubernatorial Candidates and Percentage Turnout (Cont.)
(Harris County-November, 1972)

Precinct	Total Registered	Total Voted	McGovern	Nixon	Briscoe	Grover	Percentage Turnout
334	241	145	133	5	122	9	60
340	842	512	449	45	414	48	61
342	49	No Returns					
344	1,599	899	843	40	768	46	56
355	848	541	459	71	413	76	64
357	740	421	385	18	347	22	57
365	626	494	97	385	134	332	79
367	975	607	581	21	517	36	62
368	19	7	4	3	5	2	37
369	532	277	187	66	159	13	52
371	1,285	702	358	333	382	267	55
372	741	328	217	8	306	7	44
373	103	73	72	1	63	2	71
389	2,011	1,176	831	326	507	290	59
390	1,598	1,075	760	298	553	250	67
392	2,421	1,631	1,552	52	1,375	88	67
396	1,794	1,212	1,171	30	1,008	65	68
402	352	279	206	70	190	47	79
TOTAL	185,066	111,031	94,857	13,721	86,190	13,316	60

Table 138
A Distribution of Voters in Predominantly Black Precincts
by Total Registered, Candidate, and Percentage Turnout
(November and December, 1971)

Precinct	Registered Vote	Total Vote		Percentage Turnout 12-07	Hofheinz		Welch	
		11-20	12-07		11-20	12-07	11-20	12-07
19	557	184	246	44	154	217	16	20
20	528	158	216	41	81	143	59	73
21	1,012	475	556	55	424	538	36	18
23	763	264	320	42	231	301	22	19
24	1,631	699	892	55	598	834	66	58
25	2,019	978	1,204	60	858	1,171	39	33
30	1,175	487	628	53	433	595	31	33
31	2,029	1,078	1,324	65	1,008	1,300	50	24
42	2,327	1,257	1,601	69	1,111	1,535	85	66
47	2,142	928	1,190	56	821	1,164	73	26
48	1,208	564	711	59	521	682	30	29
68	2,352	1,065	1,405	60	930	1,355	79	50
85	1,463	824	966	66	751	944	44	22
109	1,779	256	510	29	217	497	24	13
122	1,480	666	867	59	324	445	293	422
132	2,651	1,415	1,650	62	1,137	1,402	199	248
136	2,742	1,403	1,698	62	1,281	1,647	75	51
138	1,725	762	1,101	64	695	1,059	21	42
140	2,627	1,247	1,505	57	1,023	1,331	153	174
144	3,087	1,336	1,785	58	1,115	1,706	207	79
145	2,659	1,226	1,515	57	982	1,311	166	204
151	2,040	904	1,150	56	686	953	160	197
156	2,036	1,083	1,258	62	824	1,017	183	241
157	-	571	1,036	-	446	969	87	67
158	2,474	1,152	1,441	58	1,023	1,413	64	28
159	2,096	865	1,139	54	724	1,074	97	65
160	901	425	556	62	355	520	43	36
161	2,260	995	1,319	58	754	1,270	68	49
164	1,809	1,060	1,541	85	896	1,197	96	44
167	1,506	634	883	59	538	824	62	59
168	1,114	438	583	52	326	538	91	45
169	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
180	2,525	1,222	1,532	61	1,004	1,383	151	149
186	2,547	1,237	1,621	64	1,063	1,477	116	144
192	2,853	1,410	1,748	61	1,213	1,661	107	87
193	1,611	810	1,005	62	738	973	46	32
194	2,085	957	1,216	58	679	990	200	226
195	1,871	933	1,138	61	809	1,073	77	65

Table 138
A Distribution of Voters in Predominantly Black Precincts by Total Registered, Candidate, and Percentage Turnout (Cont.)
(November and December, 1971)

Precinct	Registered Vote	Total Vote		Percentage Turnout 12-07	Hofheinz		Welch	
		11-20	12-07		11-20	12-07	11-20	12-07
196	1,339	576	737	55	408	670	65	67
197	-	719	961	-	598	927	65	34
198	1,175	590	737	63	527	704	35	33
201	1,518	689	883	58	550	824	92	59
202	2,377	1,069	1,352	57	930	1,302	88	50
209	1,118	456	624	56	401	601	30	23
210	1,718	808	1,002	58	734	973	46	29
212	1,799	752	1,035	58	646	943	64	92
219	1,931	946	1,168	60	815	1,074	101	94
228	3,416	1,697	2,028	59	1,290	1,720	245	308
230	2,381	1,092	1,532	64	926	1,452	98	80
235	2,578	1,277	1,571	61	990	1,321	193	250
236	1,764	725	992	56	553	815	128	177
237	1,963	726	993	51	570	862	105	131
238	1,775	694	851	48	429	600	180	251
239	1,776	680	866	49	466	635	163	231
240	2,261	1,315	1,616	71	1,173	1,567	72	49
247	2,386	1,187	1,472	62	1,088	1,442	49	30
252	4,322	2,210	2,826	65	1,935	2,646	176	180
253	2,304	1,265	1,532	66	918	1,381	262	151
259	2,608	1,816	1,988	76	1,596	1,936	98	52
271	1,525	942	1,121	74	863	1,093	52	28
276	1,858	715	945	51	528	801	131	144
288	1,839	924	1,148	62	780	1,008	114	140
294	-	1,915	2,440	-	1,761	2,398	89	42
295	1,622	729	938	58	633	896	57	42
327	1,709	1,277	1,612	94	1,105	1,554	79	58
TOTALS	122,240	59,759	75,726	62	49,985	69,654	6,293	6,072

Table 139
A Percentage Distribution of Predominantly Mexican-American Precincts by Presidential and Gubernatorial Candidates and Percentage Turnout
(Harris County, November, 1972)

Precinct	Total Registered	Total Voted	McGovern	Nixon	Briscoe	Grover	Percentage Turnout
2	588	341	256	73	205	58	58
9	1,409	621	468	120	344	77	44
10	1,619	838	513	301	386	214	52
11	1,330	729	411	288	349	227	55
46	2,228	1,142	738	362	568	258	51
64	2,101	1,050	669	344	477	226	50
65	2,233	1,108	711	340	558	216	50
69	2,376	1,157	672	443	576	288	49
79	5,222	2,512	1,681	740	1,341	514	48
187	419	218	143	74	105	40	52
401	64	48	36	9	28	8	75
66	1,759	910	603	285	557	202	52
77	236	150	66	84	70	59	64
62	2,012	1,013	644	339	560	231	50

Table 140
A Distribution of Predominantly Mexican-American Precincts in Mayoral Campaign (Houston, Texas, 1971)

No.	Precinct	Number of Registered Voters	Total Voted	Hofheinz	Welch	Castillo	Percentage Turnout
1	1417 Houston Ave.	1,060	554	414	139	356	52
2	901 Henderson	713	317	220	96	200	45
9	Sampson & Preston	1,144	423	225	187	358	37
10	4401 Lovejoy	1,876	890	327	560	489	47
11	5000 Harrisburg	1,096	519	204	310	300	47
44	2101 South Street	1,177	485	231	253	360	41
46	1200 Quitman	2,153	1,026	590	423	744	48
62	6400 Market	1,775	889	382	505	544	50
64	7301 Ave. F	1,454	734	308	417	531	51
65	907 76th St.	1,635	800	382	416	588	49
66	801 Broadway	1,559	643	364	277	417	41
69	6901 Ave. I	1,636	799	290	507	436	49
77	3725 Fulton	1,093	648	215	432	363	59
79	6411 Laredo	2,731	1,312	598	713	836	48
107	2310 Berry Rd.	1,605	968	448	415	402	60
	TOTALS	22,707	11,007	5,198	5,560	5,521	49

TABLE 141
A DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE SHARING ALLOCATION*

County	Revenue Sharing Allocation	1970 Population	Per Capita Payment
Harris County	$5,933,840	1,741,912	$3.40
Baytown	$399,730	43,980	$9.08
Bellaire	$112,734	19,009	$5.93
Bunker Hill Village	$11,389	3,977	$2.86
Deer Park	$155,036	12,773	$12.13
El Lago	$7,317	1,011	$7.23
Galena Park	$76,300	10,479	$7.28
Hedwig Village	$10,933	3,255	$3.35
Hillshire Village	$1,783	627	$2.84
Houston	$14,566,091	1,232,802	$11.81
Humble	$21,217	3,278	$6.47
Hunter's Creek Village	$11,366	3,959	$2.87
Jacinto City	$28,704	9,563	$3.00
Jersey Village	$5,442	765	$7.11
Katy	$35,442	2,923	$12.12
La Porte	$76,969	7,149	$10.76
Lomax	$3,027	894	$3.42
Morgans Point	$4,230	593	$7.13
Nassau Bay	$39,721	4,586	$8.66
Pasadena	$749,422	89,277	$8.39
Piney Point	$7,297	2,548	$2.86
Seabrook	$28,341	3,811	$7.43
Shoreacres	$7,301	1,872	$3.90
South Houston	$105,158	11,527	$9.12
Southside Place	$8,869	1,466	$6.04
Spring Valley	$9,079	3,170	$2.86
Tomball	$34,803	2,734	$12.72
Waller	$8,176	1,123	$7.28
Webster	$6,390	2,231	$2.86
West University Place	$47,638	13,318	$3.57
Galveston County	$964,384	169,812	$5.67
Clear Lake Shores	$2,065	600	$3.44
Friendswood	$18,681	5,675	$3.29
Galveston	$701,676	61,809	$11.35
Hitchcock	$35,838	5,565	$6.43
Kemah	$11,236	1,144	$9.82
La Marque	$87,811	16,131	$5.44
League City	$62,991	10,818	$5.82
Texas City	$514,537	38,908	$13.22

---

*Source: The Houston Post, Feb. 4, 1973, p. 7/DJ.

TABLE 141
A Distribution of Revenue Sharing Allocation (Cont'd.)

County	Revenue Sharing Allocation	1970 Population	Per Capita Payment
Montgomery County	$293,218	49,479	$5.92
Conroe	$184,625	11,969	$16.42
Cut 'n Shoot	$753	200	$3.76
New Waverly	$1,015	496	$2.04
Magnolia	$1,315	261	$5.03
Montgomery	$900	216	$4.16
Patton Village	$5,971	667	$8.95
Willis	$6,839	1,577	$4.33
Fort Bend County	$488,221	52,314	$9.33
Missouri City	$25,421	4,136	$6.14
Needville	$9,860	1,024	$9.62
Richmond	$79,681	5,777	$13.79
Rosenberg	$169,140	12,098	$13.98
Stafford	$25,941	2,906	$8.92
Sugarland	$31,210	3,318	$9.40
Brazoria County	$942,144	108,312	$8.69
Alvin	$89,589	10,671	$8.30
Pearland	$59,607	6,444	$9.25
Freeport	$160,160	11,997	$13.35
Angleton	$59,980	9,770	$6.13

TABLE 142
AMOUNT OF MONEY RECEIVED IN THE FIRST INSTALLMENT OF REVENUE SHARING

New York, N. Y.	$100,847,538	Wichita, Kan.	$ 1,298,873
Chicago, Ill.	31,185,549	Akron, Ohio	1,758,408
Los Angeles, Calif.	15,781,264	Baton Rouge, La.	3,344,955
Philadelphia, Pa.	21,981,080	Tucson, Ariz.	2,196,405
Detroit, Mich.	18,302,265	Jersey City, N. J.	2,308,548
HOUSTON, TEX.	7,433,362	Sacramento, Calif.	1,634,562
Baltimore, Md.	11,831,968	Austin, Tex.	1,435,048
Dallas, Tex.	5,795,317	Richmond, Va.	2,728,602
Washington, D. C.	11,834,502	Albuquerque, N. M.	2,987,831
Cleveland, Ohio	7,214,134	Dayton, Ohio	2,100,342
Indianapolis, Inc.	5,482,887	Charlotte, N. C.	2,036,693
Milwaukee, Wis.	5,539,902	St. Petersburg, Fla.	1,442,116
San Francisco, Calif.	8,833,517	Corpus Christi, Tex.	1,576,903
San Diego, Calif.	3,132,436	Yonkers, N. Y.	871,670
San Antonio, Tex.	4,242,612	Des Moines, Iowa	1,112,067
Boston, Mass.	8,904,129	Grand Rapids, Mich.	1,536,001
Honolulu, Hawaii	6,933,488	Syracuse, N. Y.	685,245
Memphis, Tenn.	4,411,281	Flint, Mich.	1,748,127
St. Louis, Mo.	6,251,132	Mobile, Ala.	2,223,062
New Orleans, La.	8,488,471	Shreveport, La.	1,870,163
Phoenix, Ariz.	3,785,490	Warren, Mich.	1,088,691
Columbus, Ohio	3,267,245	Providence, R. I.	2,180,442
Seattle, Wash.	4,162,054	Fort Wayne, Ind.	1,089,938
Jacksonville, Fla.	4,014,785	Worcester, Mass.	2,081,363
Pittsburgh, Pa.	5,862,963	Salt Lake City, Utah	1,796,588
Denver, Colo.	5,915,173	Gary, Ind.	1,566,433
Kansas City , Mo.	4,603,544	Knoxville, Tenn.	1,755,005
Atlanta, Ga.	3,042,473	Virginia Beach, Va.	1,882,720
Buffalo, N. Y.	3,348,729	Madison, Wis.	899,799
Cincinnati, Ohio	4,132,782	Spokane, Wash.	1,171,238
San Jose, Calif.	2,084,882	Kansas City, Kan.	1,139,113
Minneapolis, Minn.	2,792,508	Columbus, Ga.	1,440,706
Nashville-Davidson, Tenn.	3,534,501	Anaheim, Calif.	583,416
Fort Worth, Tex.	2,277,266	Fresno, Calif.	1,386,104
Toledo, Ohio	2,293,844	Springfield, Mass.	1,482,094
Portland, Ore.	4,169,841	Hartford, Conn.	1,676,227
Newark, N. J.	4,246,878	Bridgeport, Conn.	1,660,580
Oklahoma, Okla.	2,731,487	Santa Ana, Calif.	745,345
Louisville, Ky.	4,674,030	Tacoma, Wash.	1,688,493
Oakland, Calif.	2,304,154	Jackson, Miss.	1,794,388
Long Beach, Calif.	1,517,152	Lincoln, Neb.	846,927
Omaha, Neb.	2,036,844	Lubbock, Tex.	953,111
Miami, Fla.	3,289,574	Rockford, Ill.	900,163
Tulsa, Okla.	2,129,832	Paterson, N. J.	1,226,381
El Paso, Tex.	2,711,743	Greensboro, N. C.	1,541,919
St. Paul, Minn.	2,122,552	Riverside, Calif.	596,711
Norfolk, Va.	3,368,770	Youngstown, Ohio	1,109,316
Birmingham, Ala.	2,486,792	Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	708,623
Rochester, N. Y.	1,145,117	Huntsville, Ala.	842,015
Tampa, Fla.	2,618,590	Evansville, Ind.	1,091,887

SOURCE: *The Houston Post*, December 9, 1972, p. 11/A.

TABLE 143
REVENUE PAYOUT BY STATES

	STATE	LOCAL
Alabama	$14,946,087	$ 29,851,298
Alaska	1,093,303	1,880,218
Arizona	8,287,130	15,639,262
Arkansas	9,710,377	17,242,515
California	92,443,559	184,712,996
Colorado	8,995,692	17,944,197
Connecticut	11,091,526	22,179,987
Delaware	3,147,459	4,791,930
District of Columbia		11,834,502
Florida	24,206,688	48,395,859
Georgia	18,092,339	36,140,362
Hawaii	3,910,786	7,821,571
Idaho	3,512,063	6,963,658
Illinois	45,211,408	89,970,805
Indiana	18,775,478	37,393,646
Iowa	12,457,786	24,895,557
Kansas	8,653,771	17,141,396
Kentucky	17,187,143	25,818,544
Louisiana	20,410,021	40,213,387
Maine	5,122,554	10,164,495
Maryland	17,671,768	35,334,416
Massachusetts	27,243,635	54,474,105
Michigan	37,033,515	73,862,622
Minnesota	17,560,612	34,835,716
Mississippi	14,746,765	29,012,902
Missouri	16,216,930	32,227,223
Montana	3,381,910	6,465,610
Nebraska	6,413,617	12,742,336
Nevada	1,889,970	3,768,024
New Hampshire	2,737,367	5,430,368
New Jersey	27,496,318	54,984,447
New Mexico	5,680,902	9,837,989
New York	97,177,125	194,104,226
North Carolina	22,442,129	44,787,299
North Dakota	3,659,188	7,046,872
Ohio	35,300,397	70,373,249
Oklahoma	9,723,562	19,378,933
Oregon	8,747,782	17,447,383
Pennsylvania	45,862,531	91,359,636
Rhode Island	3,986,659	7,973,337
South Carolina	12,165,341	23,504,044
South Dakota	3,981,456	7,668,617
Tennessee	16,310,721	32,605,795
Texas	40,958,303	81,722,265
Utah	5,047,673	9,992,880
Vermont	2,428,891	3,759,333
Virginia	17,546,071	35,082,556
Washington	12,864,706	25,583,591
West Virginia	11,503,557	14,816,000
Wisconsin	21,987,547	43,748,807
Wyoming	1,644,864	3,235,396

Source: Washington (UPI) news release.

APPENDIX B

SPECIAL REFERENCES AND SOURCE MATERIALS

I. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Criminal Justice Plan for Texas. 1972 and 1973.

Office of Information Services. *Summary of Selected Demographic Characteristics From Census Data-Fourth Count*. Austin: Office of the Governor of Texas, 1972.

United States Department of Commerce. BLS Report No. 394. *The Social and Economic Status of Negroes in the United States*.

United States Office of Education. Report of the National Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education. *The Mexican-American: The Quest for Equality*. 1968.

United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Regional Report Series #1. February, 1970. *Poverty in Houston's Central City*.

United States Department of Labor. Bulletin S-3. October, 1960. *The Economic Situation of Negroes in the United States*.

United States Department of Labor. Manpower Research Monograph No. 23. *Negro Employment in the South*. 1971.

United States Bureau of the Census. Final Report HC (2)-91, Houston, Texas SMSA. *Census of Housing: 1970, Metropolitan Housing Characteristics*.

United States Bureau of the Census. Final Report PHC (1)-89, Houston, Texas SMSA. *Census of Population and Housing: 1970, Census Tracts*.

United States Bureau of the Census. Final Report PC (1)-C45, Texas. *Census of Population: 1970, General Socio-Economic Characteristics*.

II. BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND OTHER SOURCES

"Annual Report of the Health Department, 1970-71." Houston, Texas.

"Annual Report of the Police Department, 1970-71." Houston, Texas.

Johnston, Richard J. H. "Low Income Housing Exclusions in U. S. Assailed." *New York Times*, November 7, 1969.

Hartman, Chester W. "The Politics of Housing." *Dissent*, 14 (6): 710-11.

Hawley, Willis D. *Blacks and Metropolitan Governance: The Stakes of Reform*. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, 1972.

Langendorf, Richard. "Residential Desegregation Potential." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35 (2): 94, 1969.

Ledé, Naomi W. *The Negro Voter in Dallas: A Study in Political Socialization*. Dallas: Center for Social Science Research, 1968.

Ledé, Naomi W. *De Facto School Segregation in Saint Louis*. Saint Louis: Urban League of Saint Louis, Inc., 1966.

Pino, Lewis N. Nothing But Praise: Thoughts on Ties Between Higher Education and the Federal Government. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972.

Waldman, Elizabeth, "Educational Attainment of Workers." *Monthly Labor Review*, February, 1969, pp. 14-22.

Warren, Roland. *Politics and the Ghettos*. New York: Atherton Press, 1969.

"The Economics of Health Care." *Black Enterprise*, June, 1972.

The Texas Social Welfare Association. *Proceedings of the General Session Papers, Forum, Discussions and Institutes*, "The Many Faces of Poverty," November 15-18, 1964.

The Negro Handbook. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 1970.